DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 240 098 SP 023 803

AUTHOR Defino, Maria; And Others
TITLE The Context of Clinical Preservice Teacher Education: The Student Teaching Experience. Clinical Teacher Education -- Preservice Series.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO RDCTE-9022
PUB DATE Sep 82
NOTE 153p.; For related documents, see SP 023 801, SP 023 804-806, and SP 023 813.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; *Cooperating Teachers; *Educational Environment; Higher Education; *Institutional Characteristics; Preservice Teacher Education; School Districts; Student Characteristics; *Student Teacher Supervisors; *Student Teaching; Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Placement; Teacher Responsibility; Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

This report contains findings and discussion concerning the influence of contextual factors upon the student teaching experience. Introductory remarks explain the rationale for the study as well as the substance of other documents resulting from it. A section describing methodology reports that data for the study were collected from two sites: a large public university whose student teachers were assigned to mid-sized urban or small suburban school districts, and a large private university which worked with an urban school district. Demographic characteristics of the two settings (such as faculty composition, class size, etc.) are reviewed, and their possible relationship to several quantitative indicators are explored. Formal rules and regulations, published by participating teacher education institutions and school districts, to govern student teaching are presented and compared. Available data about informal organizational properties, such as reward and support systems for each participant role (student teacher, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor), are reviewed and discussed. Implications of the findings for practitioners and researchers in teacher education are included throughout the text. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED240098

THE CONTEXT OF CLINICAL PRESERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION: THE STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Maria Defino, Susan Barnes
and Sharon O'Neal

Report No. 9022

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

O. H. Bown

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

To order additional copies of this report or a catalog of publications, contact Communication Services, Research & Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, Education Annex 3.203, Austin, Texas 78712.

The project presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the National Institute of Education, Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education

The University of Texas at Austin

Austin, Texas 78712

THE CONTEXT OF CLINICAL PRESERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION: THE STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Maria Defino, Susan Barnes
and Sharon O'Neal

Report No. 9022

This Publication is One of

a Series on

Clinical Teacher Education--Preservice

Gary A. Griffin, Program Director and
Principal Investigator

September 1982

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables. vii

Abstract. xi

Preface xiii

Introduction. 1
Rationale. 1
Organization 2

Methodology 3
Sample Description 3
Procedures 3
Data Analysis. 4

Characteristics of Participating Universities 8

Characteristics of Participating Elementary and Secondary Schools and their Populations. 8
Staff Characteristics. 9
Pupil Characteristics. 10
Class Size 13
Grade Level Composition of Schools 14
Pupil and Neighborhood Demographics. 15
Additional Context Variables 17
Relation of Context Data to Quantitative Data. 19
Summary. 48

Formal Organizational Properties of the Two Participating Universities 48
Requirements for Admission to the Teacher Education Programs . . 49
The Placement of Student Teachers. 50
Student Teaching Requirements. 52
Certification and/or Credentialing 56
Grievances 60
Placement Services 62
Selection into the Role of Supervisor. 63
Description of Student Teaching Responsibilities of State University Supervisors 65
Description of Student Teaching Responsibilities of Supervisors at Metropolitan University 72
Discussion of Student Teaching Responsibilities at the Two Sites. 75
Description of Requirements for Selection as a Cooperating Teacher. 76
Cooperating Teacher Role Orientation and Responsibilities. . . . 77

Table of Contents, Continued

Informal Organizational Properties of Universities. 81
Informal Organizational Properties Related to Placement of Student Teachers 81
Description of Grievance Procedures. 83
Informal Organizational Properties of the Universities Relating to the University Supervisor. 84
Informal Organizational Properties of the Public Schools Relating to the Cooperating Teacher. 109
Description of Selection Requirements and Process. 110
Description of Training for the Cooperating Teacher Role 114
Description of Orientation to the Role of Cooperating Teacher. . 116
Description of Responsibilities to the Student Teacher 117
Description of Cooperating Teachers' Support System 124
Description of Cooperating Teachers' Reward System 125

Summary 127

Reference Notes 135

References. 137

Appendix A, Background Information. 139

List of Tables

Table 1. List of Languages and Number of Schools in which They Were Spoken 11

Table 2. Summary of ANOVA of the Executive Responsibilities TWLI Subscale by Site, Participant Type, and Sample 21

Table 3. Cell Means of Cooperating Teachers, Student Teachers, and University Supervisors at Two Sites on the Executive Responsibilities Subscale of TWLI 22

Table 4. Summary of ANOVA of the Institutional Constraints TWLI Subscale by Site, Participant Type, and Sample 26

Table 5. Cell Means of Cooperating Teachers, Student Teachers, and University Supervisors at Two Sites on the Institutional Constraints Subscale of TWLI 27

Table 6. Summary of ANOVA of the Rewards TWLI Subscale by Site, Participant Type, and Sample 29

Table 7. Cell Means of Cooperating Teachers, Student Teachers, and University Supervisors at Two Sites on the Rewards Subscale of TWLI 30

Table 8. Summary of ANOVA of the School Norms TWLI Subscale by Site, Participant Type, and Sample 32

Table 9. Cell Means of Cooperating Teachers, Student Teachers, and University Supervisors at Two Sites on the School Norms Subscale of TWLI 33

Table 10. Summary of ANOVA of the Dissatisfaction TWLI Subscale by Site, Participant Type, and Sample 35

Table 11. Cell Means of Cooperating Teachers, Student Teachers, and University Supervisors at Two Sites on the Dissatisfaction Subscale of TWLI 36

Table 12. Summary of ANOVA of the Orientation Subscale of the Student Teacher Expectations Instrument by Site and Sample 40

Table 13. Cell Means for Student Teachers at Two Sites on the Orientation Subscale of the Student Teacher Expectations Instrument 41

List of Tables, Continued

Table 14. Summary of ANOVA of the Competence Subscale of the Student Teacher Expectations Instrument by Site and Sample 43

Table 15. Cell Means for Student Teachers at Two Sites on the Competence Subscale of the Student Teacher Expectations Instrument 44

Table 16. Summary of ANOVA of the Value of Prior Courses Subscale of the Student Teacher Expectations Instrument by Site and Sample 45

Table 17. Cell Means for Student Teachers at Two Sites on the Value of Prior Courses Subscale of the Student Teacher Expectations Instrument 46

Abstract

As one in a series of reports about a major, multi-site investigation into student teaching, this report contains findings and discussion concerning the influence of contextual factors upon the preservice clinical teacher education experience. Introductory remarks explain the rationale for the study as well as the substance of other documents resulting from it. Next a section is provided which outlines both the types of data collected and the analyses applied to them. Demographic characteristics of the two settings (such as school faculty composition, class size, etc.) are reviewed, and their possible relationships to several quantitative indicators are explored. The formal rules and regulations published by participating teacher education institutions and school districts to govern student teaching are presented and compared. Finally, available data about informal organizational properties, such as the reward and support systems for each participant role (student teacher, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor), were reviewed and discussed. Implications of the findings for practitioners and researchers in teacher education are included throughout the text.

Preface

Professional education is characterized by a unique feature which is absent from other educational opportunities. This feature, clinical education, is manifest in teacher preparation programs most typically as student teaching. The importance of student teaching appears to be assumed by most, if not all, persons concerned with the education of teachers-to-be. Yet, discipline and comprehensive inquiries into the processes and outcomes of student teaching, with a few exceptions, have been sporadic and often lacking in focus.

The Research in Teacher Education (RITE) program area of the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at The University of Texas at Austin conducted a large-scale study of student teaching during the fall and winter of 1981-1982. This descriptive study was designed to provide a comprehensive picture of the clinical component of the professional education of teachers.

This report is one of a series which depends upon the data from this investigation for descriptive findings, conclusions, speculations, and implications. Other reports in the series have been and will continue to be made available by RITE.

The RITE conceptualization of student teaching focused upon three major components of the experience: participants in the process, interactions between and among the participants, and the contexts in which student teaching takes place. It is the last of these which is the primary concern of this report. Two large colleges of education, two school districts, and thirty-five elementary and secondary schools served as contexts for the experiences studied by RITE. The characteristics, formal and informal, of these contexts and their apparent influence upon student teaching are reported in this document. During the fall of 1982, the material from this report and from

others will be combined with still unreported findings to provide a full description of the clinical component of preservice clinical teacher education.

This report was written by Maria E. Defino, Susan Barnes, and Sharon O'Neal of the RITE staff. As is true of any large-scale study, however, many others contributed to the content and form of the report. Among these important others are Sara Edwards, Hobart Hukill, Robert Hughes, Jr., Guadalupe Guzman, Linda Mora, and Luann McLarry. We are also grateful for suggestions made by Center colleagues Julie Sanford and Bill Rutherford. Freddie Green and Vicky Rodgers provided patient and efficient assistance in the preparation of the manuscript.

We continue to be grateful to the more than two hundred participants in the study. They demonstrated their professionalism again and again as they provided the data upon which this report and others are based.

Gary A. Griffin

Principal Investigator

The Context of Clinical Preservice Teacher Education: The Student Teaching Experience

Introduction

A major research investigation of preservice clinical teacher education, or student teaching, was conducted during the fall of 1981 by the Research in Teacher Education (RITE) program division of the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. One goal for the study was to describe in detail the student teaching experience at two sites, in terms of the characteristics, behaviors, and interactions of cooperating teachers, student teachers, and university supervisors of student teachers within their institutional contexts. The present report addresses the last area of emphasis of the study, the institutional contexts of student teaching.

Rationale

The preservice clinical experience in teacher education, often called student teaching, is the capstone of the professional preparation of most teachers. After student teaching the novice is presumed to be adequately prepared to assume responsibility for his/her own classroom. Most student teachers expect to achieve this minimum competency as an outcome of their professional preparation and most educational institutions attempt to meet this general goal through their programs. Even though most preservice programs emphasize actual classroom performance in the evaluation of student teachers, many factors inside and outside the classroom may influence the performances of those people involved most intimately with student teaching, namely the university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and student teachers. In order to fully describe the student teaching experience, the interactions of the systems of governance and procedures of both the universities and the

public school systems, as well as the individual classroom settings, must be taken into account. This report is an attempt to describe some factors which may act as constraints upon the student teaching experience.

Since this report is part of a series produced by the RITE program resulting from the Clinical Teacher Education - Preservice Study, some reference to these is indicated. For a more detailed rationale for the study, a literature review, a description of the methodology, as well as appended instruments, the reader is referred to Griffin, Hughes, Barnes, Carter, Defino, and Edwards (Note 1). A comparative analysis of documents related to the teacher education programs at the two sites and preliminary background and demographic information gathered by questionnaire from the participants in the study is contained in Hughes, O'Neal, and Griffin (Note 2). Further analysis and findings related to personal and professional characteristics, change, and outcomes as measured by self-administered psychological tests are presented in Hughes and Hukill (Note 3) with instruments in final form appended.

Organization

The following points are addressed specifically in the present report. First, a methodology section is provided which details more fully the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data. Next the general characteristics of participating universities and the characteristics of participating elementary and secondary schools and their populations are described. Third, the formal regulations of the participating universities and public school systems are reviewed, followed by a discussion of the informal organizational properties of participating universities and public schools. Finally, a summary is provided.

Methodology

Sample Description

The following analyses are based on data collected by the RITE staff from two sites. The first site was State University (SU)*, a large public university whose student teachers were assigned to elementary schools in either a mid-sized urban school district or a smaller suburban school district. These districts together are referred to as Lakeview. At this site data were collected on 43 cooperating teachers, 44 student teachers, and 13 university supervisors. The second site was a large, private university (Metropolitan or MU) located in a large urban center. Data were collected on 45 cooperating teachers (39 at the elementary level, 6 at secondary), 49 student teachers (43 at the elementary level and 6 at secondary), and four university supervisors who were assigned to schools in the Urban school district. The sample was composed of a general and an intensive group of participants. At each site university supervisors, principals and others were asked to identify 10 effective cooperating teachers. These cooperating teachers (10 at each site) and the student teachers and university supervisors with whom they worked composed the intensive sample (20 cooperating teachers, 20 student teachers, nine university supervisors).

Procedures

The intensive subsample was drawn in order to gain more comprehensive data from that group. Both the intensive and general sample participants completed background questionnaires at the beginning of the student teaching experience and self-administered five instruments at the beginning, middle, and end of the student teaching experience. These instruments included the

---

*Names of institutions and cities have been changed to protect anonymity.

Educational Preference Scale (Lacefield & Cole, Note 4), Teacher Concerns Questionnaire (Fuller, 1969), Rigidity-Flexibility Index (Hughes, Griffin, & Defino, Note 5), Internal-External Locus of Control (MacDonald & Tseng, Note 6), and the Self-Perception Inventory (Soares & Soares, 1968). Two other measures, Paragraph Completion (Hunt, Greenwood, Noy, & Watson, Note 7) and Empathy Construct Scale (LaMonica, Note 8), were completed only at the beginning and end of the semester. In addition the Quick Word Test (Borgatta & Corsini, 1960) was self-administered only at the start of the semester while the Teacher Work-Life Inventory (Blumberg & Kleinke, Note 9) was administered only at the end of the semester. The intensive sample also kept journals, audiotaped their conferences, and participated in beginning, middle and end of semester interviews. Additionally, cooperating teachers and student teachers in the intensive sample were observed three and four times, respectively, over the course of the semester. The general sample responded in writing to abbreviated forms of the interview protocol at times coinciding with the interviews of the intensive sample.

Data Analysis

The major data sources for this report consisted of the interviews of the intensive sample, published documents from the institutions involved, and the questionnaires answered by all participants. A discussion of the analysis of each data source follows.

Interview data. In an effort to reduce the bulk of information found in the interviews a coding scheme was developed. It was created with the following principles in mind:

1. The smaller the number of categories, the greater the chance of accurate coding.

2. Coding should aim at reducing bulk without expunging information and flavor.

3. The subjects' language should be preserved at all costs.

The first attempts at organizing interview data resulted in a large and complex category system. The number of categories was reduced by focusing on the gross and significant topics addressed in each interview. The following four categories grew out of the data:

1. Background. Information placed in this category refers to the characteristics of the student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors and the experiences and preparation that they had had prior to the current semester. Examples include formal course work, inservice training, and/or social service preceding the student teaching semester.

2. Teaching. This category includes all information about the student teachers', cooperating teachers', or university supervisors' experiences when they were in charge of instruction. (This could have been with one child, a group of children, or the entire class.) Any of the following information would be relevant: the topic of subject covered, the organization of the class activity, who planned and directed the activity, and who the participants were.

3. Supervision and Teacher Education. All statements about the experiences germane to the monitoring and evaluation of student teachers' performance and its improvement belongs to this category. Information might refer to what was communicated, and when and how; what was observed, when and by whom; what was covered in student teaching seminars; what were the participants' professional and personal

relationships throughout the semester; and how well a participant responded to supervision.

4. Goals, Expectations and Ideals. Frequently, interviews contained information about the personal, behavioral and academic aims, aspirations and ambitions of the student teacher, the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor. Also found were statements couched in terms of ideal teaching, supervision or practice teaching experiences. This information is included here, as are any individual's goals for someone else, such as cooperating teachers' hopes for student teachers' progress, university supervisors' intentions for supervising student teachers at a later visit to the school, and student teachers' goals for children in their cooperating teachers' class.

Each interview question was first classified according to its intended focus. Data analysts then read all the answers to one question. Those portions of the answers which seemed pertinent to the question were underlined. All answers to one question were then grouped together for ease of reading. Each data analyst then constructed a paragraph summarizing the answers to individual questions. These summaries noted the following four items: (1) most frequent answer; (2) differences in answers across role types (student teachers, cooperating teachers, and supervisors) and across sites; (3) the least frequent answers; and/or, (4) a noteworthy area that was omitted altogether.

This was done for the purpose of extracting identifiable "themes" or trends in response content. Often, the conceptualizations about background experiences, goals, etc. were expressed as themes common to all participant types in both locations, emphasizing the fact that people enter and leave the student teaching experience with sets of shared beliefs which may not

otherwise be directly evident. In particular, themes extracted from interview data form the backbone of the discussion of informal processes of the university presented later in this report.

Documents. In order to examine the student teaching programs at Metropolitan and State Universities, official university and public school documents were examined. The Director of Field Services at each university and the Offices of Staff Development for each school system provided the RITE staff with documents which delineated the major roles and responsibilities of the participants in the student teaching experience, stated the prescribed university curricula necessary at each institution in order to be recommended for state credentialing, as well as stipulated the recommended guidelines for observations and evaluations of the student teachers.

Questionnaires. All participants, in both the general and intensive samples, completed the Background Questionnaire (Appendix A) prior to the beginning of the study. The questionnaire was developed by the RITE staff in order to obtain as much information about the sample as possible. Such information was a necessary precaution against sampling error, whereby findings could be the result of having obtained a unique sample with regard to site or participant role.

In addition, participants responded to the instruments described above, as well as two rating scales generated by the RITE staff to assess participants' expectations for, and satisfaction with, the student teaching scale (see Hughes & Hukill, Note 3). Analyses of the questionnaires included calculation of descriptive statistics (e.g., standard deviations, frequencies, intercorrelation matrices, etc.) and inferential statistics (particularly ANOVAs of scores across participant roles, sample types, and sites). Findings resulting from specific analyses will be presented together with their

possible interpretations in each section of the report. Given this overview of the methods and procedures utilized for data collection and analysis, the characteristics of participating sites may be presented and discussed.

Characteristics of Participating Universities

Two universities were involved in this study, Metropolitan University and State University. Metropolitan University is an exclusive private institution of approximately 27,000 students located in a major urban area. Its College of Education includes 58 full time faculty, 9 joint appointments, and 110 adjunct faculty and lecturers. State University, on the other hand, is one of the largest state institutions in the country, containing close to 47,000 students. Approximately 2,350 students were seeking certification through completion of requirements at the university (the number is inclusive of graduate students, those in language arts, etc.). The State University College of Education employs approximately 152 full time equivalent faculty members. It is located in a midsize city with some light industry. Both institutions offer bachelor's, master's and doctoral programs in education which are fully accredited by state, regional and national agencies.

Characteristics of Participating Elementary and Secondary Schools and their Populations

In order to attain a more complete picture of the context in which student teaching occurs, the RITE staff garnered data about several aspects of the participating schools' composition. Among these were the number and types of school faculty, languages spoken by each school's pupils, demographics of the school children, school building age, parental involvement, and so on. It was not always possible to gather information about all aspects of composition from all schools, and in some cases data represent only one of the two study sites (this will be drawn to the reader's attention whenever appropriate).

More specific information about the demographic, personal and professional characteristics of the participating student teacher, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors have been reported elsewhere (Hughes and Hukill, Note 3).

Staff Characteristics

Findings. Information about the schools' faculties and administrations appear typical of most districts in the nation. For example, across the two sites, 34.8% of the principals were women. An overall average of .88 full time equivalent (FTE) additional administrators were present in each building but there were pronounced site differences behind this average. At Lakeview, a mean of .44 FTE other building administrators were in each school, whereas a mean of 1.6 FTE administrators were in each building in the participating Urban district schools.

Parallel differences across sites in the quantities of other school faculty and staff are noticeable also. For example, there were twice as many classroom teachers per building in the Urban district as there were in Lakeview ($\bar{x}$ = 50.5 and $\bar{x}$ = 25, respectively). While there was an overall average of 9.7 teacher aides per building, Lakeview had an average of three aides per school; Urban schools had an average of 20.5. Urban had twice as many FTE counselors per building as Lakeview (1.6 and .8, respectively). One apparent exception to this trend concerns the number of special teachers per building (e.g., art, music, etc.). Lakeview reported an average of .9 FTE special teachers per building, whereas Urban reported an average of .39 FTE special teachers.

Discussion. Interpreting both the general trend in staffing differences and the exception is less difficult than it might appear. Urban is a substantially larger district (in terms of geography and numbers of students)

than Lakeview; therefore one might reasonably expect it to have larger faculties and staff, on the average. In addition, some of the discrepancies may reflect the inclusion of two secondary level schools in the Urban district (only elementary schools were in the Lakeview sample). For example, the secondary schools did not report any art or music teachers as special teachers, thereby deflating the Urban average. Also, secondary schools may be more likely to have additional administrators and counselors assigned on a full time basis than are elementary schools, which may have contributed to some of the differences in these figures across sites as well.

Pupil Characteristics

Findings pertaining to cultural diversity. The next contextual aspects examined focus more upon the students in the schools, than upon the schools per se. As a way to address the issue of pupil cultural diversity, the number of languages spoken by children in each school was reported to the RITE staff by the participating schools' administrators. Table 1 displays a list of the languages (other than those served by bilingual programs) which school administrators from the two sites have documented as being spoken by pupils in their buildings. Each column shows the number of schools which reported having children who speak the language listed. As should be apparent from a glance, Urban schools have both higher overall frequencies of foreign languages and a much greater variety of foreign languages represented than do Lakeview schools.

Discussion. The relatively wide cultural diversity apparent in the Urban schools may pose several interesting problems for Urban's teachers and student teachers. The implications pertain largely to the instructional decision-making which must occur in this context, the use of instructional time, and the resources which districts may employ to assist the classroom

Table 1

List of Languages and Number of Schools in Which They Were Spoken

	Lakeview (16 schools in sample)	Urban (10 schools in sample)
Arabic	0	2
Armenian	0	1
Bengali	0	1
Chinese	1	5
Farsi	0	1
French	2	1
German	0	1
Japanese	0	5
Korean	0	8
Laotian	0	1
Malay	0	1
Norwegian	0	1
Persian	0	1
Philipino	0	4
Samoan	0	2
Spanish	2	5
Sudanese	0	1
Tagalog	0	2
Thai	0	1
Vietnamese	0	5

teacher. For example, it would seem likely that when a teacher must plan instruction for a heterogeneous versus a homogeneous group of students--whether that heterogeneity refers to achievement scores, cultural background, or proficiency in the English language--the teacher's decision-making process becomes much more complicated (see, e.g., Evertson & Hickman, Note 10). This is due to the teacher's need to make allowances for students with different "entry level" skills prior to commencing a particular academic task. Anticipating and preparing for wide ranges of learner needs is demanding even for very experienced teachers, and may constrain the time and energy which cooperating teachers may spend with their student teachers. It could also translate into a greater likelihood that the student teachers may be viewed as "extra hands" to execute decisions made by the classroom teacher.

To compound this situation, teachers are confronted with the reality of having a limited number of hours per day available for planning and instructing. When students are being taken from their regular classroom activities for English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction, for instance, time is lost from the regular academic day. Thus, it is possible that teachers with pupils who are still learning English are being expected to accomplish as much if not more with them in relatively less academic time. The greater the "press" experienced by cooperating teachers, the less reasonable it may seem to share decision-making processes or time with student teachers, and the more hesitant cooperating teachers may be to relinquish needed instructional time to the less experienced student teachers.

As one would anticipate, however, districts which have high frequencies of students learning English as a second language probably provide or develop formal mechanisms and resources for dealing with them. Among the most easily documented and most common are bilingual education programs designed to serve

particular schools or grade levels. While bilingual education programs are not without costs, such as the loss of regular instructional time, few would argue that they are without benefit. In the Urban district, for example, 80% of the schools in the sample offered bilingual education programs in Spanish-English, Chinese-English, Japanese-English, and so on in grades K-9 (different grades and languages in the various schools). Among the participating Lakeview schools, 62% offered Spanish-English bilingual programs in grades 1-5 (again, different grades in the various schools). At both sites, unless a program is available, teachers seem to deal with bilingual children on an individual basis (often relying upon peer tutoring).

Class Size

Findings. Some differences across sites in pupil numbers were observed. While there was an average of 608 students per building in the Lakeview schools, the Urban schools contained an average of 1,211.8 students each. This was consistent with both the reported numbers of teachers per building, and the inclusion of (typically larger) secondary schools in the Urban sample. In terms of overall numbers, the ratio of mean number of students per building to mean number of teachers per building was approximately equal across sites (608 students with 25 teachers per building in Lakeview, compared to 1211.8 students with 50.5 teachers per building in Urban, or about 24:1). However, the difference was not reflective of similar pupil:teacher ratios within the classrooms at each site, although this was what appeared to be the case when comparing the overall site averages. As a subset of the building and district populations, it was possible to describe the mean pupil:teacher ratio of the ten intensive sample classrooms observed by the RITE staff at each site. These numbers worked out to be the following (and were more consistent with staff impressions of the pupil populations in the classrooms): Lakeview had

an average of 22.34 pupils observed in each classroom, while Urban classrooms were observed to contain an average of 28.34 pupils.

Discussion. From a teaching--as opposed to statistical--viewpoint, the extra six students (on the average) could constitute a difference in one's daily workload. On the basis of these data, it would not be fair to state that the key difference across sites was a matter of simple proportion (i.e., Urban schools held twice as many same-sized classrooms as Lakeview schools). If that were the case, one might suspect the work life of teachers in each place to be quite similar--but other contextual factors did not appear to be equal, further mitigating any but the most general similarities.

As one example of this, about 12% of the students in the participating Urban schools are bused to school each day; all of the busing is voluntary. In marked contrast is the 34% of participating Lakeview students who are bused each day. Roughly 80% of them (or 27% of all students in the participating schools) are subject to a compulsory busing program.

Grade Level Composition of Schools

Findings. The grade level composition of schools in the sample varied across sites, also. Five of the Urban schools contained grades K-6; two held PreK-6; one held K-9; the junior high held grades 7-9; and the senior high consisted of grades 10-12. The Lakeview schools showed greater variety of grade level structure. Six participating Lakeview schools held grades K-6; three held K and 4-6 only; three held K-3 only; and one each contained grades 3-5, 4-6, 5-6, and K and 3 only.

Discussion. More than one interpretation of this contrast in grade level composition may be valid. For instance, it seems reasonable to state that Urban's schools are patterned after relatively traditional grade structures, reflecting the age and stability of the Urban school system (to wit, all 10

Urban school buildings were more than 10 years old). On the other hand, Lakeview is a relatively young and rapidly developing community with compulsory busing as an attempt to achieve racially balanced schools. These combined factors may be at least partly responsible for some of the unusual grade level combinations housed within the latter district's school buildings.

Pupil and Neighborhood Demographics

Findings. Pupil ethnicity, pupil socioeconomic status (SES), and the SES of neighborhoods surrounding schools at the two sites are also factors which contribute to understanding the contexts in which student teaching may occur. While the Urban district, by policy, did not furnish RITE staff with information about the ethnicities of all its pupils, it would seem reasonable (from the languages represented in Table 1) to state that a broad mix of ethnicities was present. This statement was at least partially substantiated by the comments of two Urban principals about their schools: "[we have a] natural ethnic mix: 28% Black, 25% White, 24% Hispanic, 22% Asian and 1% American Indian;" and "[this school has a] multi-racial student body."

The Lakeview schools contained less diversity. Mean percentages of ethnicities across participating Lakeview schools (according to 1980-81 data) are as follows: 26% Hispanic, 13% Black, and 61% Anglo. The range in percentages of ethnicities at each building reported by the Lakeview schools is interesting, as well: from 0% to 71% Hispanic, from 0% to 40% Black, and from 14% to 100% Anglo. The reader is reminded at this time that the 16 schools at the Lakeview site are drawn from two adjacent school districts (14 schools are in one of them, 2 are in the other); the district with two participating schools draws students from a virtually all Anglo community.

The SES information also is somewhat skewed by the inclusion of schools from two districts in the Lakeview site. About 75% of the children in the two

schools in the smaller district were from upper-income families. The SES of the two schools' neighborhoods was similarly rated "Upper middle" by the building principals. In the remaining Lakeview schools, 11 out of 14 were described as being in middle income neighborhoods and the remaining three were described by the principals as being in low SES neighborhoods.

Pupil SES in the remaining 14 schools was indexed by calculating the percentages of pupils on free or reduced-price lunch programs. On this basis, an average of 49.4% of the students were from low income families (the percentages ranged from 9% to 94% low SES pupils in each building); 50.6% were from middle or high income families (the range was from 7% to 91% middle or high SES pupils in each building).

The nine Urban schools which supplied information about the SES of their pupils and the school neighborhoods provide an interesting parallel to the Lakeview data: an average of 11.9% of the students were reported as being from upper income families (ranging from 0% - 35% in each school), an average of 41.6% were from middle income families (ranging from 2% - 80% in each school), and an average of 42.4% were reported to be from low income families (ranging from 15% - 98%). Thus, despite the contrast in racial composition, both sites on the average seem to consist mostly of pupils from middle and low income families, with lower incomes appearing to be somewhat overrepresented. The wide ranges in the reported percentages of pupils at each SES level were similar.

The picture of financial similarity across sites is altered when consideration is given to the SES of the neighborhoods in which Urban schools are located. Only 4 of the 10 were described by principals as being in middle SES neighborhoods. Three were said to be in low SES neighborhoods. Two were said to be in "mixed" SES neighborhoods; one of these in a 50-50 middle and

lower SES neighborhood, and the other in a 1/3 upper, 1/3 middle, and 1/3 lower SES neighborhood. Thus, speaking in terms of proportions, more Urban than Lakeview schools tended to be in low SES neighborhoods (30% versus 21%).

Additional Context Variables

Information on certain other contextual variables was collected only from the Urban schools; the Lakeview central administration did not have records which provided the information specifically about each of the 16 campuses, and contacting each of the sixteen principals to obtain these details was not feasible for the RITE staff. The variables included were parental involvement in the schools, the numbers and types of special programs and assistance (in addition to bilingual education) available, and lists of "unique" features about the schools volunteered by building principals.

Findings and discussion of parent attitudes. The interest and attitudes of parents and the immediate community around a school may influence the context to a significant degree. Four of the 10 participating Urban school principals mentioned parents and/or community as part of the unique characteristics of their schools. Whenever parents or community were mentioned, they were described in a favorable or positive light: "interested parents," "[we are] truly a community school, stable staff and community," "parent cooperation," and "excellent attitude--parents, children and staff." None of these schools were in strictly low SES neighborhoods. Whether or not this link is in any way causal is impossible to determine (e.g., this could reflect the administrators' attitudes more than an apparent lack of parental interest in or support for the schools in low SES neighborhoods); but the association existed.

Findings and discussion of special assistance. The special programs, financial and program assistance, and special personnel available to a school

or school district may also influence the educational context in which student teaching takes place. The Urban schools reported a relatively wide variety of special financial assistance, special programs and personnel. For example, eight of the 10 mentioned School Improvement funds or program assistance. Eight had special programs for educating gifted children, and two of these received extra financial assistance for maintaining gifted programs. Nine mentioned bilingual education as contributing either financial or programmatic assistance to their schools. Three of the 10 received Title I funds. Numerous other individual sources of support were mentioned by the principals (financial assistance - eight schools; program assistance - eight schools; special personnel - seven schools; special programs - all 10).

While some may regard this extensive listing of supports as a positive contextual aspect, it is not without some cost to the individuals in the Urban schools. For example, the amount of paperwork involved in the conduct and administration of these programs adds substantially to the regular workload. The loss of instructional time devoted to the regular curriculum, which results from any "pull-out" programs (not solely bilingual education), compresses the teachers' work as well as the students'. The point begging emphasis, then, is increased appreciation and acknowledgement of instructional trade-offs which occur as special programs, monies, and so on proliferate to a degree where returns may be diminished.

Findings and discussion of unique features of schools. Among the last contextual aspects of the Urban schools that were investigated were the "unique" characteristics of the schools (as volunteered by the principals in response to an open-ended question). Nine of the 10 principals responded to the question. In addition to the theme of positive parental or community

relations mentioned by four schools were the following idiosyncratic bits of written information:

-- "A caring, nurturing, supportive atmosphere"

-- "Year-round structure"

-- "We are the second largest school in the district and have classes located on 3 different campuses." (This was an elementary school.)

-- "Excellent teachers, coordinators, classified staff."

-- "Natural ethnic mix"

-- "Multi-racial student body, dedicated staff."

-- "Excellent attitude--parents, children and staff."

-- "Yes, a highly professional teaching staff."

It is interesting to note that, just as supervisors and cooperating teachers often seemed to discuss student teacher strengths in terms of personality or other inferred characteristics (see pp. 91-96 this report), so did administrators speak of their staffs and schools. Attitude, dedication, excellence, and professionalism are among the inferred qualities which they cite. The directionality of this pattern cannot be established; e.g., one cannot say if it is set during preservice clinical experiences and is carried with educators as they advance, or if cooperating teachers are observing patterns which are somehow set by administrators. Nonetheless, the apparent pervasiveness of this response tendency is interesting and merits further inquiry.

Relation of Context Data to Quantitative Data

All of the above context information--especially that which indicates differences across the two sites--may be related logically to teacher, student teacher, and university supervisor perceptions of work life. The reader will recall that the Teacher Work-Life Inventory (TWLI; Blumberg & Kleinke, Note 9) was administered to all participants in order to obtain a quantitative picture

of these perceptions. Teachers rated the inventory items on a four-point scale, from "this feature stands out very sharply in my work-life," to "this feature does not stand out at all in my work-life." The present discussion will focus on the participants' factor scores (see Hughes & Hukill, Note 3 for the description of TWLI factor derivation) and a series of hierarchical ANOVAs computed to assess any site, participant, or sample differences among them, in relation to what is known about the contextual variables.

Findings pertaining to TWLI "Executive Responsibilities" subscale. The first TWLI factor subscale, termed "Executive Responsibilities," is composed of six items similar to the following: "dealing with problems," or "being responsible for others." Two significant interaction effects resulted from the hierarchical analysis of variance done across the variables "site," "participant type," and "sample type" (see Table 2): a two-way interaction between participant type (student teachers, cooperating teachers, or university supervisors) and sample (intensive or general), $p = .028$; and a three-way interaction between participant type, sample, and site, $p = .040$.

Discussion. Because the latter of the two findings is more pertinent to the present discussion and includes the results of the former, it will be discussed exclusively. Four observations can be made about the cell means displayed in Table 3. First, general sample student teachers at both sites report a similar sense of executive responsibility, while the intensive sample of student teachers at Lakeview reported that executive responsibilities stood out more sharply in their work lives than did student teachers at Urban. Second, intensive and general sample cooperating teachers at Lakeview rated executive responsibilities as a less prominent part of their work lives than intensive and general sample cooperating teachers at Urban (the intensive sample showed the most contrast). Third, intensive sample university

Table 2

Summary of ANOVA of the Executive Responsibilities

TWLI Subscale by Site, Participant Type, and Sample.

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Site	25.305	1	25.305	3.513
Participant type	9.589	2	4.794	.666
Sample	.004	1	.004	.000
Site x Participant Type	34.499	2	17.250	2.395
Site x Sample	6.925	1	6.925	.961
Participant Type x Sample	52.337	2	26.169	3.633*
Site x Participant Type x Sample	30.882	1	30.882	4.287*
Explained	154.613	10	15.461	2.146
Residual	1282.255	178	7.204	
Total	1436.868	188	7.643	

* $p < .05$

Table 3

Cell Means of Cooperating Teachers, Student Teachers, and University Supervisors at Two Sites on the Executive Responsibilities Subscale of TWLI.[1]

	Cooperating Teachers		Student Teachers		University Supervisors	
	Intensive Sample	General Sample	Intensive Sample	General Sample	Intensive Sample	General Sample
State	19.60 (N=10)	18.38 (N=32)	16.10 (N=10)	18.81 (N=32)	19.20 (N=5)	16.88 (N=8)
Metro	17.10 (N=10)	16.91 (N=33)	18.44 (N=9)	18.14 (N=36)	17.75 (N=4)	* *

[1] Highest possible score = 24

* No entries occurred here due to the fact that supervisors at Metropolitan were dual triad members, i.e., each worked with student teachers in both the intensive and general samples.

supervisors at State University report that executive responsibilities stood out less sharply in their work lives than did intensive sample university supervisors at Metropolitan University. Fourth, the general sample university supervisors at State University were compared against an empty cell (but this was taken into account through the use of a hierarchical ANOVA; see Hughes & Hukill, Note 3).

Several implications and interpretations of these results may be offered, although some tenativeness remains due to the nature of the statistical analysis. The first two observations above may be treated together, since they appear to be complementary: student teachers at Lakeview may be given more responsibility by their cooperating teachers than are student teachers at Urban. Consequently, the cooperating teachers at Lakeview may sense less of a burden from executive responsibilities than do the cooperating teachers at Urban. If one moves beyond a "closed system" view of the dyads, however, alternate explanations with a degree of conceptual elegance become available. For example, it was noted earlier that there are, on the average, nearly seven times as many teacher aides per building in the Urban schools compared to the Lakeview schools. Because classroom teachers work most directly with teacher aides, and the Urban teachers have more aides to work with, the cooperating teachers there may be more likely to experience added executive responsibilities stemming from having the aides in their rooms (rather than from the pupils). In a similar train of thought, the intensive sample student teachers at Lakeview <u>may</u> be needed more by their cooperating teachers due to the relative scarcity of teacher aides; ergo, they may be given more managerial or executive responsibilities than their Urban counterparts. In view of the Lakeview general sample student teachers' failure to follow suit, however, it is possible that intensive participation in the present study may

have been directly associated with these student teachers' reports of a higher sense of executive responsibility.

Pertaining to the third observation (that intensive sample university supervisors at State University felt executive responsibilities stood out less sharply in their work lives than did intensive sample supervisors at Metropolitan), once again contextual information assists in the interpretation of the data. Three of the five supervisors at State University were graduate students, and four of the five were supervising on a part-time basis (the remaining person was a full-time supervisor). Conversely, all four Metropolitan University supervisors were supervising student teachers on a full-time basis, and all had been working in that capacity for at least 10 years. In addition, all were employed jointly by the school district and the university. One could therefore expect the Metropolitan supervisors to report that executive responsibilities were a more prominent aspect of their work lives than the less experienced, part-time people with fewer student teachers at State University.

Findings pertaining to TWLI "Institutional Constraints" subscale. The second subscale of the TWLI was labeled "Institutional Constraints"; participants rated how sharply ten items such as "Tension," "Immediacy of demands," "Busy schedule," and "Specified procedures" stood out in their work lives. Two significant differences were found (see Table 4): a main effect for participant type (cooperating teachers rated themselves significantly less constrained than either student teachers or university supervisors), $p = .042$; and a two-way interaction between participant type and being in the intensive or general sample, $p = .041$.

To study the second result a bit more closely, general sample supervisors rated themselves as being far more subject to institutional constraints than

did the intensive sample university supervisors (see cell means in Table 5). Intensive sample student teachers reported a somewhat greater sense of constraint than did their cooperating teachers, their (intensive sample) supervisors, or general sample student teachers.

Discussion. Once again, contextual information is the source for several plausible explanations of findings which might not otherwise make sense. It is apparent from the analysis of variance that site per se does not appear to be associated with any significant differences; but the lack of "true" general sample supervisors from Metropolitan University clouds the picture somewhat, because the largest contrast was found between general and intensive sample supervisors (Metropolitan supervisors were dual participants, i.e., each worked with pairs of students and cooperating teachers in both the intensive and general samples). The reader will remember that all of the general sample supervisors were also graduate students; as such, they were subject to constraints from the university, both as employees and as students, and from the school districts as cooperative professionals. Conversely, the supervisors at Metropolitan were employed jointly by the Urban school district and the university, and this was their only work. Perhaps supervisors who are not joint employees view themselves almost as guests in the school district; therefore they might feel more obligated to attend to institutional norms and constraints than those who are formally secured within the district. This is speculation, of course. Also, the cooperating teachers at neither site responded to this subscale as one would expect the stereotypic harried classroom teacher to do; perhaps this reflects the instructional freedom which

Table 4

Summary of ANOVA of the Institutional Constraints TWLI Subscale by Site, Participant Type, and Sample

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Site	1.796	1	1.796	.076
Participant Type	152.814	2	76.407	3.229*
Sample	2.071	1	2.071	.088
Site x Participant Type	4.712	2	2.356	.100
Site x Sample	28.112	1	28.112	1.188
Participant Type x Sample	154.110	2	77.055	3.257*
Site x Participant Type x Sample	17.529	1	17.529	.741
Explained	421.155	10	42.115	1.780
Residual	4140.652	175	23.661	

*$p < .05$

Table 5

Cell Means of Cooperating Teachers, Student Teachers, and University Supervisors at Two Sites on the Institutional Constraints Subscale of TWLI[1]

	Cooperating Teachers		Student Teachers		University Supervisors	
	Intensive Sample	General Sample	Intensive Sample	General Sample	Intensive Sample	General Sample
State	25.20 (N=10)	24.81 (N=32)	22.90 (N=10)	23.56 (N=32)	26.40 (N=5)	20.13 (N=8)
Metro	25.10 (N=10)	25.15 (N=33)	19.78 (N=9)	23.94 (N=36)	24.75 (N=4)	*

[1] Highest possible score = 40

* No entries occurred here due to the fact that supervisors at Metropolitan were dual triad members, i.e., each worked with student teachers in both the intensive and general samples.

most teachers have despite the load of managerial or executive responsibilities given them (Griffin, 1979). The teachers are employed (for the most part) within one institutional context, the school district. All of these bits of information seem to yield a complex picture, in which those individuals who physically and psychologically must shuttle between more than one institution will almost necessarily report that institutional constraints are a more prominent aspect of their work lives. Again, however, the nature of participation in the intensive sample may have been in some way associated with the apparent difference in work life perceptions. For example, the reflection necessary to complete personal journals by the intensive sample may have facilitated a certain amount of reality checking (e.g., "I have freedom of choice within these parameters").

Findings pertaining to TWLI "Rewards" subscale. The third factor on the TWLI was named "Rewards" and included seven items such as "Colleagueship," "Being appreciated," "Kids," and "Excitement." No significant differences across sites or participants were obtained in the analysis of variance (see Table 6). This is not surprising in view of the cell means displayed in Table 7.

Discussion. These results seem to underscore the prevailing opinion that teaching may serve as an avenue to salient, if not financial, rewards. To wit, the grand mean score of 21.06, summed over seven four-point items (out of a possible maximum of 28), is relatively high. On the average, teachers, student teachers, and supervisors indicated that these items stood out "quite sharply" in their perceptions of work life. One might speculate, also, that the rewards may be common to nearly all helping professions, and not just teaching and teacher education.

Table 6

Summary of ANOVA of the Rewards TWLI Subscale by Site, Participant Type, and Sample

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Site	6.421	1	6.421	.522
Participant Type	9.417	2	4.709	.383
Sample	24.136	1	24.136	1.961
Site x Participant Type	6.623	2	3.312	.269
Site x Sample	.321	1	.321	.026
Participant Type x Sample	16.875	2	8.437	.685
Site x Participant Type x Sample	13.492	1	13.492	1.096
Explained	94.191	10	9.419	.765
Residual	2154.159	175	12.309	

Table 7

Cell Means of Cooperating Teachers, Student Teachers, and University Supervisors at Two Sites on the Rewards Subscale of TWLI.[1]

	Cooperating Teachers		Student Teachers		University Supervisors	
	Intensive Sample	General Sample	Intensive Sample	General Sample	Intensive Sample	General Sample
State	22.70 (N=10)	20.66 (N=32)	21.40 (N=10)	21.25 (N=32)	20.60 (N=5)	21.88 (N=8)
Metro	21.30 (N=10)	20.36 (N=33)	22.67 (N=9)	20.94 (N=36)	19.25 (N=4)	* *

[1] Highest possible score = 28

* No entries occurred here due to the fact that supervisors at Metropolitan were dual triad members, i.e., each worked with student teachers in both the intensive and general samples.

Findings pertaining to TWLI "School Norms" subscale. A fourth factor subscale of the TWLI consisted of nine items and was labeled "School Norms." The items included statements such as, "Repetitive activity," "Formal relationships," "Specified procedures," and "People as supervisors and subordinates." Only one significant difference resulted from the analysis of variance (see Tables 8 and 9): a main effect for participant type ($p = .002$), in which student teachers reported that school norms did not stand out as sharply in their work lives as they did for cooperating teachers or university supervisors.

Discussion. Two largely speculative interpretations of this result may be given. First, because cooperating teachers and university supervisors typically have spent more time interacting as professionals within the schools than the student teachers, they may be more aware of the institutional norms and informal regulations which guide their behavior. However, when asked about whether or not they had been informed in advance and/or in writing of their responsibilities and duties in these particular roles, four cooperating teachers said they had received no prior information, but only two student teachers said this. Therefore a second possibility is that most student teachers are as aware of the school norms as cooperating teachers and supervisors are, but could feel they (student teachers) are not held as accountable for adherence to the norms as are the latter two groups. This may be due to a perception or belief that student teachers are not "true" or formal members of the school organization--a perception which could be shared across all three types of participants in the student teaching experience, regardless of the particular school districts involved.

Table 8

Summary of ANOVA of the School Norms TWLI Subscale by Site, Participant Type, and Sample

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Site	13.483	1	13.483	.996
Participant Type	170.856	2	85.428	6.309*
Sample	13.844	1	13.844	1.022
Site x Participant Type	50.888	2	25.444	1.879
Site x Sample	.649	1	.649	.048
Participant Type x Sample	52.065	2	26.033	1.923
Site x Participant Type x Sample	34.695	1	34.695	2.562
Explained	329.930	10	32.993	2.437*
Residual	2369.473	175	13.540	

*$p < .01$

Table 9

Cell Means of Cooperating Teachers, Student Teachers, and University Supervisors at Two Sites on the School Norms Subscale of TWLI.[1]

	Cooperating Teachers		Student Teachers		University Supervisors	
	Intensive Sample	General Sample	Intensive Sample	General Sample	Intensive Sample	General Sample
State	18.50 (N=10)	18.16 (N=32)	16.90 (N=10)	19.59 (N=32)	1880 (N=5)	15.75 (N=8)
Metro	16.50 (N=10)	17.97 (N=33)	20.22 (N=9)	20.42 (N=36)	17.25 (N=4)	* *

[1] Highest possible score = 36

* No entries occurred here due to the fact that supervisors at Metropolitan were dual triad members, i.e., each worked with student teachers in both the intensive and general samples.

Findings pertaining to the TWLI "Dissatisfaction" subscale. The fifth subscale of the TWLI which was examined consisted of 8 items such as "Frustrating circumstances," "Conflict," "Boredom," and "Immediacy of demands." This scale was labeled "Dissatisfaction" and again only one significant difference was observed (see Table 10). In this case, a main effect across samples was observed ($p = .055$): general sample triads reported that the sources of dissatisfaction stood out more sharply in their work lives than they did for the triads in the intensive sample (see the cell means in Table 11).

Discussion. More than one explanation of this main effect may be offered, although it is not possible to support or refute them given the present data. First, the reader is reminded that cooperating teachers in the intensive sample were nominated by various school and university officials as being outstanding in that role. Many of these nominations had been based upon reputational excellence in classroom teaching and in providing good learning experiences for student teachers. Thus, it is possible that the teachers comprising the intensive sample are more successful, and more satisfied and fulfilled in their jobs than those in the general sample. Therefore they may be better able to satisfy others (especially their student teachers).

A second and equally plausible explanation pertains to a set of concrete differences across intensive and general sample participants. The reader will recall that participation in the RITE study imposed increased demands upon intensive sample participants. Perhaps something about the nature of such intensive participation (e.g., having to write about one's work at least twice weekly) caused increased reflection and therefore more appreciation for the

Table 10

Summary of ANOVA of the Dissatisfaction TWLI Subscale by Site, Participant Type, and Sample

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Site	5.083	1	5.083	.344
Participant Type	12.754	2	6.377	.431
Sample	55.290	1	55.290	3.740*
Site x Participant Type	8.448	2	4.224	.286
Site x Sample	3.838	1	3.838	.260
Participant Type x Sample	76.918	2	38.459	2.601
Site x Participant Type x Sample	.083	1	.083	.006
Explained	174.464	10	17.446	1.180
Residual	2587.433	175	14.785	

*p = .05

Table 11

Cell Means of Cooperating Teachers, Student Teachers, and University Supervisors at Two Sites on the Dissatisfaction Subscale of TWLI.[1]

	Cooperating Teachers		Student Teachers		University Supervisors	
	Intensive Sample	General Sample	Intensive Sample	General Sample	Intensive Sample	General Sample
State	16.80 (N=10)	17.78 (N=32)	16.20 (N=10)	18.19 (N=32)	19.40 (N=5)	15.63 (N=8)
Metro	16.20 (N=10)	18.00 (N=33)	16.22 (N=9)	18.82 (N=36)	17.25 (N=4)	* *

[1] Highest possible score = 32

* No entries occurred here due to the fact that supervisors at Metropolitan were dual triad members, i.e., each worked with student teachers in both the intensive and general samples.

satisfying, positive aspects of work life. There is no way, at present, to determine which of these explanations (among others) may be accurate.

Findings pertaining to the Student Teaching Satisfaction scale. In contrast to the "Dissatisfaction" subscale of the TWLI are the student teachers' scores on the Student Teaching Satisfaction Scale (Hughes & Hukill, Note 3). High scores on this scale are presumed to reflect high levels of satisfaction. Out of a possible total of 110 points, the mean score for all student teachers was 90.7 points. All analyses of variance produced nonsignificant results.

Discussion. In view of the above it seems reasonable to suggest that student teachers are generally satisfied with their experiences, regardless of personal or organizational contexts. Other explanations seem possible, also. For example, a social desirability or Hawthorne effect could have been operating. If so the high scores would be more reflective of the student teachers' desire to represent their experiences as satisfying, rather than their actual personal satisfaction with the experience. A second, related possibility is that the student teachers were responding in a way reflective of cognitive dissonance; e.g., "I had to work for this (even if I didn't like it or learn a lot), so it must have been a basically worthwhile experience."

Finally, an interesting comparison between the student teachers' reported levels of satisfaction and the cooperating teachers' general impression of their own student teaching experiences can be made. When intensive sample cooperating teachers were interviewed about their impressions of their own student teaching, only eight of the 20 had strong favorable impressions; seven had extremely negative impressions. This is in marked contrast to the generally favorable ratings which student teachers assigned to their own current experience. This apparent discrepancy leads to the formulation of

several questions. First, have teacher education programs, and specifically clinical preservice experiences, improved substantially over time (is the difference real)? Or is the difference reflective of the two methods used to collect the data (a rating scale and an open-ended interview question)? Third, are student teachers relatively naive consumers of the preservice clinical experience, such that placement experiences have not improved, but student teacher awareness of placement inadequacies is minimal until after full-time teaching has begun? All of these are legitimate questions for future research.

Findings from the CT and US Expectations scales. Two other instruments revealed similar results. Analyses of variance done on the Expectations scales (one for cooperating teachers, one for university supervisors; Hughes & Hukill, Note 3) did not yield any significant results across participant type, site, or sample.

Discussion. Three basic interpretations of this information can be offered. First, cooperating teacher and university supervisor expectations may be common to everyone in those roles in teacher education. Second, the expectations themselves may be so general as to hold true for anyone in an apprentice-expert relationship. Last, and conversely, the Expectations instruments may not have been sensitive enough to detect anything more than the presence of some expectations which were met. Once again, it is not possible at the present time to say which (if any) is the most satisfactory explanation.

Findings from the "Orientation" subscale of ST Expectations scale. Student teachers were asked to rate how well their expectations had been met on another instrument developed by the RITE staff (Hughes & Hukill, Note 3). The first subscale was labeled "Orientation to the Profession," and pertained

to whether or not student teachers liked or enjoyed their experience as much as they had anticipated. Although the mean subscale score of 15.45 was not far from the midpoint of 18 ("I liked it just as much as I had expected I would, no more and no less"), a significant main effect for sample type (intensive/general) was obtained ($p = .039$; see Tables 12 and 13). The intensive sample student teachers reported actual enjoyment of the experience to be more closely matched to their prior expectations than the general sample. The latter group reported that they had liked student teaching more than they had expected.

Discussion. Several interpretations of these results are plausible. Perhaps the most obvious question is whether or not intensive participation in the study was in any way responsible for the difference. For example, the requirements of taping conferences and keeping personal journals may have caused the student teachers to reflect more about both their expectations and their actual experiences, which in turn may have been associated with a greater match between the two. A second possibility is that a Hawthorne effect may have occurred, whereby student teachers in the intensive sample were better acquainted with the nature and purposes of the RITE study and therefore chose to be as accurate as possible in responding to the instruments. In contrast, general sample participants may have responded more hastily, more generally, and more in the direction of social desirability ("I liked it even better than I thought!"). In any case, however, it would seem that school composition as a context variable does not appear to play a major role in the match between student teachers' expectations for enjoyment and their appraisals of enjoyment of the clinical preservice experience.

Findings pertaining to "Competence" subscale. The second subscale of the Student Teacher Expectations instrument was labeled "Competence in Student

Table 12

Summary of ANOVA of the Orientation Subscale of the Student Teacher Expectations Instrument by Site and Sample

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Site	.287	1	.287	.888
Sample	63.552	1	63.552	4.414*
Site x Sample	5.131	1	5.131	.356
Explained	68.970	3	22.990	1.597
Residual	1151.839	80	14.398	

*$p < .05$

Table 13

Cell Means for Student Teachers at Two Sites on the Orientation Subscale of the Student Teacher Expectations Instrument[1]

	Student Teachers	
	Intensive Sample	General Sample
State	16.60 (N=10)	15.03 (N=33)
Metro	17.75 (N=8)	14.97 (N=33)

[1]Highest possible score = 36

Teaching." The grand mean of 10.43 is relatively farther off the midpoint of 15 than was the case on the Orientation subscale; again, a main effect across sample ($p = .030$) occurred, in which general sample student teachers reported greater disparity between their expectations and their appraisal of how well they had performed in the classroom (see Tables 14 and 15). The mean for the general sample was 9.98 ("I taught better than I expected"), compared to the mean of 12.06 ("I taught somewhat better than I expected") for the intensive sample.

Discussion. Because the differences are in the same general direction as they were on the Orientation subscale (both groups had surpassed their expectations, but the positive shift was greater for the general sample), the same interpretations may apply here as above.

Findings from the "Time" subscale. The third subscale pertained to the "Time" spent on student teaching. The grand mean equalled 31.87 (compared to a scale midpoint of 36). No significant differences were found.

Discussion. It seems reasonable to conclude that student teachers tend to feel that the various aspects of student teaching (grading, preparation, instruction, and so on) took somewhat more time than they had anticipated it would. This appears to be consistent with many spontaneous comments offered during interviews with RITE staff.

Findings pertaining to the "Value of Prior Courses" subscale. The fourth subscale examined the relative "Value of Prior Courses" which student teachers had taken as part of the professional sequence. The overall mean rating of 2.41 is not far from the scale midpoint of 3 (e.g., student teachers found prior coursework to be slightly more valuable in student teaching than they had expected), but a significant main effect for site ($p = .034$) was discovered (see Tables 16 and 17). Student teachers from Metropolitan felt

Table 14

Summary of ANOVA of the Competence Subscale of the Student Teacher Expectations Instrument by Site and Sample

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Site	12.860	1	12.860	.990
Sample	63.348	1	63.348	4.875*
Site x Sample	32.847	1	32.847	2.528
Explained	109.054	3	36.351	2.798*
Residual	1039.517	80	12.994	

*$p < .05$

Table 15

Cell Means for Student Teachers at Two Sites on the Competence Subscale of the Student Teacher Expectations Instrument[1]

	Student Teachers	
	Intensive Sample	General Sample
State	10.60 (N=10)	9.88 (N=33)
Metro	13.88 (N=8)	10.09 (N=33)

[1]Highest possible score = 30

Table 16

Summary of ANOVA of the Value of Prior Courses Subscale of the Student Teacher Expectations Instrument by Site and Sample

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Site	3.180	1	3.180	4.634*
Sample	.007	1	.007	.010
Site x Sample	.028	1	.028	.040
Explained	3.214	3	1.071	1.561
Residual	54.896	80	.686	

*$p < .05$

Table 17

Cell Means for Student Teachers at Two Sites on the Value of Prior Courses Subscale of the Student Teacher Expectations Instrument[1]

	Student Teachers	
	Intensive Sample	General Sample
State	2.61 (N=10)	2.59 (N=33)
Metro	2.15 (N=8)	2.22 (N=33)

[1]Highest possible score = 5. Note that this scale is scored in reverse: lower numbers indicate that courses were more valuable than expected.

their prior education courses were somewhat more valuable than did the student teachers from State University ($\bar{x}_m$ = 2.21 compared to $\bar{x}_s$ = 2.60, where 1 = "very much more valuable than expected").

Discussion. This result of a site difference may or may not be construed to be a function of school composition. For example, it may be that the nature of coursework across the two institutions differed in quality (however one wishes to define that; e.g., "better" instructors, a better-integrated curriculum, "better" tests, etc.). It could also be that the two universities offer comparable coursework, but the coursework has differential applicability to the school districts in which the student teaching is occurring. Finally, it is conceivable that the student teachers at Metropolitan were, for some unknown reason, better at utilizing the professional preparation received through the university.

Findings from the "Plan to Teach" item. A final item assessed on the Student Teacher Expectations scale concerned whether or not student teachers planned to teach (1 = yes, 2 = no) upon completion of all certification requirements. The mean for all student teachers was 1.10. No significant differences across site or sample type were observed.

Discussion. It seems reasonable to conclude that most, but not all, of the student teachers in the RITE sample are determined to continue with their career choice. There is no way (at present) to distinguish how many will actualize their intentions. The latter remains as a question for future research.

In conclusion, participants' responses to several instruments were analyzed in relation to the site where student teaching was conducted. In several cases differences were observed; particular subscales of the Teacher Work-Life Inventory revealed significant differences for the site variable, as

did the "Value of Prior Courses" subscale of the Student Teacher Expectations instrument. Other subscales seemed to reflect multiple determination, such as the three-way interaction for participant type, site, and sample on the "Executive Responsibilities" subscale of the TWLI (which seems reasonable: one's responsibilities will almost necessarily vary with one's designated role; the role specifications will vary with the school district; and greater demands were made of those persons in the intensive sample). Thus, the personal and institutional contexts in which student teaching is embedded can be associated with differences in the way the experience is perceived (and therefore responded to) by its participants.

Summary

Several characteristics of the schools and school children which greet student teachers are believed to influence the perceived nature of the clinical preservice experience in a variety of ways. Among those investigated here are school faculty/staff size, pupil cultural diversity, pupil and school neighborhood demographics, class size, and school grade level composition. Their relation to several psychological constructs, such as student teacher expectations, were explored. In addition to these concrete factors, other constraints serve as contextual boundaries for student teaching. Perhaps the most prominent of these are formal organizational properties of the universities (and more specifically the teacher education programs) which sponsor and direct the student teaching experience, as discussed in the next major section of this report.

Formal Organizational Properties of the Two Participating Universities

Two bodies of university rules and regulations which impact student teaching were examined in their published forms. First are those rules

directly governing the teacher education program, such as the admission requirements for the program and for entrance into student teaching. The second set includes those which determine who may serve as a university supervisor and how that role is defined. Each of these will be discussed in this section of the report in terms of the two universities participating in the RITE study. As is true with almost any organization, the reader is cautioned that these printed rules and regulations may seem to differ from their operational counterparts; nonetheless it should be valuable to review the information as it has been published.

Requirements for Admission to the Teacher Education Programs

Description of State University. State University lists the requirements for admission to its teacher training program in a university-published book entitled Teacher Education - A Student Handbook (1980). The first requirement is student completion of a one semester-hour course in educational psychology. As a part of this course students are required to take the "Admission Assessment Battery," a set of psychological instruments. The handbook states that "it is part of the procedure used to help you assess your personal strengths and weaknesses especially as they apply to teaching" (1980, p. 29). In addition students wishing to enter the program must (1) have junior standing, which requires 54 hours of completed college work, (2) have an overall grade point average (GPA) of 2.25, (3) demonstrate adequate speech, and (4) have their vision and hearing tested. Once these requirements are met, the student is admitted to the program and may begin to undertake teacher education coursework.

Once admitted to the program, a student must apply for student teaching no later than May 1 of the year before he/she intends to student teach. Individuals desiring to student teach at the elementary level must have earned

an overall GPA of 2.35. Those in the secondary teacher education sequence must have either an overall GPA of 2.50 in both of their chosen "teaching fields" (e.g., the subject matter they intend to teach), or a 2.65 in one and a 2.25 in the other. All students must have senior standing. In addition those pursuing a credential must have either a minimum of six advanced hours at State University in each of their teaching fields, or nine advanced hours in their composite field (i.e., a combined major).

Description of Metropolitan University. Information regarding education degree requirements is listed in the Bulletin of the Metropolitan University School of Education (1981). Additionally, to be eligible to student teach at either the elementary or secondary level, students must have completed two education courses, "The Teacher, School, and Society," and "The Learner, Learning and Evaluation." Students must also have senior standing, a 2.20 GPA over all courses, and be enrolled in an approved degree program prior to commencing student teaching.

Given that the university students have met all of their respective institution's requirements for entering student teaching, the tasks of locating and arranging appropriate placements for them assume prominence. The next section will address the complexities of the placement process, as it is pivotal to determining the personal context in which student teaching occurs.

The Placement of Student Teachers

Description of State University. Information on the placing of student teachers is found in the Handbook for University Student Teaching Supervisors (1979). It indicates that the placement of student teachers in secondary schools is handled by coordinators (who are university faculty members) in the different subject areas. Occasionally supervisors, typically lower in the

organizational hierarchy than coordinators, are called upon to help with the task of placement.

At the elementary level, the Director of Field Experiences makes tentative assignments of student teachers to cooperating teachers. The university supervisors then take these assignment sheets to the schools in which they will be working for the principal's final approval. The principal is free to change any assignments. Note that the Director of Field Experiences has classified the potential cooperating teachers into three groups: effective cooperating teachers, questionable cooperating teachers and ineffective cooperating teachers. If the principal wishes to place a student teacher with cooperating teacher identified as being ineffective, he/she must contact the Director. If the principal can assure the Director that past problems with that teacher will not recur, then the assignment can be approved on a trial basis. Next, all master assignment sheets are signed by both the university supervisor and the principal whereupon they are returned to the Office of Student Field Experiences. At both the secondary and elementary levels, any administrator or teacher who has responsibility for the classroom to which the student teacher is assigned may terminate his/her assignment in that classroom at any time and for any reason. They need not show cause or allow for a review.

Description of Metropolitan University. The placement of student teachers for Metropolitan University is discussed in Teacher Education Guidelines (1975), a handbook published by the Urban Unified School District. This set of guidelines states that the university supervisor is primarily responsible for the placement of student teachers. Each supervisor is assigned to a selected number of schools. He or she then works through those

schools to aid student teachers by providing the types of assignments that will assist them in developing the skills necessary for success.

Discussion of placement regulations. The contrast between the two institutions can hardly escape notice. State University has a centralized placement process which is basically affirmed or modified by those most directly involved in and responsible for student teaching (supervisor, principal, student teacher, and cooperating teacher), whereas Metropolitan's supervisors are expected to manage student teacher placements in toto. Although State's secondary level coordinators are typically regular faculty members, many of its secondary and elementary supervisors are graduate students on quarter- or half-time assistantships; whether this is the cause or the result of the organizational structure and chain of command described above is impossible to discern. It is equally difficult to know whether the functional differences in placement procedures are associated with differences in the ease with which student teachers are accommodated into the placement setting. In any event, once student teaching placements are established, the novitiates have yet another set of requirements which must be met prior to certification. These are discussed next.

Student Teaching Requirements

Description of State University. The general requirements for the completion of student teaching at both the secondary and elementary level are delineated in the university bulletin, Handbook for Student Teachers (1979). This handbook was designed and edited by the Director of Field Experiences at the university. The following requirements are stipulated (paraphrased here for brevity).

Student teachers are to:

1. Recognize that the cooperating teachers have ultimate responsibility for what student teachers do or do not do in the classroom.
2. Know and follow the rules, regulations and policies of the school.
3. Maintain an ethical and professional attitude toward all members of the school community.
4. Make themselves available for regular planning and feedback sessions.
5. Make adequate plans of teaching assignments; share copies with the cooperating teacher and university supervisor.
6. Regularly attend student teaching and related seminars.
7. Continuously assess their growth as teachers.
8. Assume responsibility for making effective contributions to the ongoing curriculum.
9. Open a placement file in the Education Placement Center.

In addition school calendars, absences, outside responsibilities, and student teaching evaluations are discussed. With regard to the university and public school calendars, the handbook states that the university may have a holiday when public schools are in session. Although the university cannot require a student teacher to continue teaching on those days, he/she is encouraged to proceed with student teaching in order to avoid interference in his/her sequence of instruction. If the student teacher chooses to take the university holiday, the handbook states that he/she is required to provide the cooperating teacher with lesson plans. For those days on which the public school has a holiday and the university is in session, the university supervisor requires student teachers to attend sessions on campus. No student teachers are excused on these days. If the school or school district is

conducting inservice sessions on these days, the student teachers are expected to attend unless specifically requested not to by the school district.

Student teachers are advised not to be absent from their assignments for other than serious health problems. If for some reason a student teacher is unable to be present, then he/she must notify both the cooperating teacher and university supervisor as far ahead of time as possible. The student teacher is also advised to assume responsibility for sending plans and/or materials to the school if such was his/her responsibility for that day. Failure to notify the specified individuals may result in the termination of the student teacher's placement. In addition the student teacher is required to notify his/her university supervisor and cooperating teacher in advance whenever he/she is going to be absent from class on a religious holiday. Prior approval from supervisors and cooperating teachers alike is necessary to facilitate the scheduling of make-up time and work.

Whether or not absences are to be made up, then, depends on the situation. If a student teacher requests permission for an absence to attend a job interview, then he/she must make up the absence. If the student teacher is absent because of illness, then he/she may be expected to make up the absences if progress in student teaching has been affected by the absence. If at any time in the judgment of a given university supervisor and/or cooperating teacher, the student teacher's absences are excessive his/her assignment may be terminated.

Outside activities are also discussed in the handbook. Students teachers are advised to hold outside activities (e.g., other courses, employment, sports, etc.) to a minimum during student teaching. Although the maximum advisable course load is 12 semester hours, the handbook recommends that most students register for less. Student teachers may not use outside

responsibilities as an excuse to not meet their classroom responsibilities. If this happens, the student teachers are given an immediate choice--drop student teaching or reduce outside responsibilities.

Student teaching assessment and evaluation is another area of responsibility discussed in the handbook. The handbook states that:

> A copy of the student teaching evaluation is given to student teachers at the start of the semester. This form is completed by both the university supervisor and cooperating teacher at the end of the semester and placed in the student teacher's file in the Education Placement Center. The student teacher is advised to become familiar with this form and seek feedback from the supervisor throughout the semester with respect to the categories included.

At the end of the semester the student teacher is entitled to see these assessment forms. He/she is required to sign them as evidence of their having been seen.

Description of Metropolitan University. Metropolitan University makes available a publication delineating the responsibilities of those individuals involved in the student teaching program. The Basic Elementary Orientation Bulletin (1977) is published by the teacher education department and stipulates the following requirements (paraphrased for brevity).

1. Three section lesson plan folders are required. Each of these should include statements of objectives, materials needed, instructional procedures, and student teacher evaluations of the success of each lesson. Weekly and long range plans are to be developed for each subject area; daily plans are submitted a day in advance. Plans are mandatory for any teaching to be conducted by the student teachers.

2. All student teachers begin each subject block with detailed lesson plans, although simplified lesson plan forms should be used after the third week of successful detailed planning and teaching.
3. Specific times for weekly conferences should be arranged.
4. Absences, except those allowed by the university, will be made up.
5. Student teachers are given competency task sheets to examine prior to teaching each subject. They are to check off appropriate items for the grade level and secure the cooperating teacher's approval and initials.
6. Art should be taught throughout the semester in order to develop a sequential program.
7. Some playground supervision is required.
8. Lesson plans for all-day teaching are to be submitted for approval two days in advance.

Information specific to those student teaching at the secondary level was unavailable. In any event, once the student teachers have successfully followed the guidelines and requirements furnished through their respective institutions' handbooks, they may be presumed ready for the certification and/or credentialing process. These will be examined, as they affect candidates from each university, in the next section.

Certification and/or Credentialing

Description of State University. In Teacher Education: A Student Handbook (1980) student teachers are advised about obtaining a certificate in the following way (paraphrased).

1. Student teachers must apply for their teaching certificates; no certificate is automatically granted with a degree. They are to apply in the Certification Office, Education Building, by mid-term

(about mid-November, first week of April, first week of July) of their last semester. There is a $2.00 certification fee and an additional transcript fee. The application must be notarized.

2. National Teacher Examinations (NTE). Some school districts require scores on the NTE. Student teachers may obtain information and the application form at the Measurement and Evaluation Center on the State University Campus. There is a separate $14.00 fee for the common exam and for the area exam. The tests are given three times a year: November, February, and July. Student teachers must apply about one month in advance. The NTE is not required for certification in the state.
3. Student teachers need to be certain that they will have completed all degree and certification requirements.

State University therefore does not automatically grant the recipient of a degree in Education a State teaching certificate. Application is made to the State by individuals. The university does, however, provide an office on campus whereby students may submit an application for certification.

Description of Metropolitan University. Like State University, Metropolitan University does not automatically grant their candidates in teacher education an official certificate (or "credential" as it is known in that state). Students are instead advised to complete an application at the opening of the semester in which all requirements toward the teaching credential will be completed. Metropolitan provides a "credential technician" on campus to serve students. The following specific requirements for teaching credentials are outlined in the Bulletin of Metropolitan University School of Education (1981; paraphrased here):

1. All graduate students who wish to pursue work leading to recommendation for a credential must have been admitted to the university. They should contact the Director of Teacher Education to verify eligibility and formalize program advisement.

2. Constitution Requirement. At least two units in a course in the principles and provision of the United States Constitution completed in an approved institution are required. An examination may be taken and passed in lieu of the coursework. Application for exercising this option may be obtained at the Metropolitan Testing Bureau or any other accredited or approved institution.

3. A course in health education in Grades K through 12 (2 units) is required.

4. A grade of A or B in both introductory written English courses or one advanced English writing course is required.

5. All students pursuing a credential must take a course about mainstreaming. (Special Education Skills, 3 units.)

6. A physical examination, which must be approved by the Metropolitan Student Health Service, is required of all teacher training candidates.

7. A personal identification (fingerprint) card must be submitted with the initial application for a teaching credential.

8. There is a residence requirement; satisfactory evidence of residency is achieved through completion of 24 units to be taken at Metropolitan University. In addition, regular standing must have been established by the Office of Admissions.

9. Credential applications should be made at the opening of the semester in which requirements will be completed. Materials are distributed by the credential technician.

10. In order to enter the clinical preservice component of the professional sequence, students must take the following steps: (a) They must establish a credential program with a counselor in the Education Building and complete preadmission courses. Satisfactory ratings in these courses are essential for admission to the student teaching program (or "directed teaching," as it is referred to at Metropolitan). (b) Students must submit, during the semester preceding that in which directed teaching is desired, an application for admission to directed teaching to the Committee on Personnel and Credentials in the Office of Directed Teaching. All transfer students applying for directed teaching must submit to the Office of Directed Teaching transcripts of all work taken in other institutions.

If the student has chosen to complete a 4-year academic program at Metropolitan University a "Preliminary Credential" is issued by the state. The Preliminary Credential is good for five years. A fifth year of postgraduate work (i.e., 28 units of graduate level coursework) is required if the student wants to obtain a "Clear Credential." Clear Credentials are issued by the state upon completion of all requirements and the fifth year of coursework.

Discussion of credentialing requirements. Once again, note the differences across the two institutions, both in terms of simple quantities of requirements and in terms of the two levels of certification offered through Metropolitan University. At State University, once a student teacher obtains certification, he/she is apparently certified unconditionally. No stipulations about future advancement (e.g. through additional coursework) are made; this is reflective of the offering of only a four-year program, unlike Metropolitan's four- and five-year programs.

In any case, while most teacher education students are able to proceed through their professional sequences and field work without encountering major difficulties, there are a few who will have problems. Each of the sites participating in this study has made provisions for voicing complaints through some manner of grievance system. These will be discussed in the following section.

Grievances

Description of State University. State University's grievance procedures are found in their published handbooks for cooperating teachers, student teachers and university supervisors. The cooperating teacher is advised in his/her handbook to direct most questions to the university supervisor. If the supervisor is unavailable, or unable to be of assistance, teachers are asked to call the Director of Student Field Experiences at the University. Cooperating teachers are also asked to direct suggestions for improvement of the teacher training program to the Director of Field Experiences or to the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education.

In addition, if it becomes apparent to the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor during the course of a semester that a student teacher will not be able to progress in the development of his/her teaching skills in the time allotted for student teaching, the student teacher must be notified as soon as possible. The student teacher will be asked to drop the course during the last class week and re-register in a subsequent semester. Only if the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher are both of the opinion that the student teacher lacks the ability to ever develop minimum competency as a teacher will he/she be failed in the course.

If university supervisors need information or advice regarding the guidance of student teachers, they are asked in the university supervisor's

handbook to contact the coordinator of student teaching. If the failure or dropping of a student teacher is necessary they are to follow the aforementioned advice given to the cooperating teacher. Any comments or suggestions regarding The Handbook for University Student Teaching Supervisors (1979) are asked to be directed to the Office of Student Field Experiences.

Student teachers are also given information on grievance procedures in the Handbook for Student Teachers (1979). If the student teacher feels his/her university supervisor or cooperating teacher is not fulfilling his/her responsibilities, the student teacher is asked to contact the Director of Student Field Experiences at State University.

Description of Metropolitan University. Grievance policies with regard to inadequate performance of a student teacher are listed in Teacher Education Guidelines (1975), a publication provided by the Urban Unified School District. In the section entitled "Suggestions for Counseling Student Teachers with Serious Instructional Problems," this publication asked the cooperating teacher to discuss all problems concerning inadequacies with the student teacher and a representative from the university as soon as they are detected. If the student teacher's performance is so poor that the instruction of students is jeopardized, then the cooperating teacher may refuse to permit the student teacher to continue training at that school. In addition, cooperating teachers are advised to use the regularly scheduled conferences to help solve crisis situations. This publication asked that serious and repeated problems be discussed with all personnel involved. No recommendations for grievance procedures are stipulated for the student teacher or the university supervisor.

Student teachers must also contend with the inevitable problem of locating full-time employment in their chosen field, upon completion of degree

and certification requirements. To assist in this process, both of the participating universities offer a variety of placement services to their students. These will be reviewed next.

Placement Services

Description of State University. The university-published book entitled Teacher Education - A Student Handbook (1980) discusses the career placement services available upon completion of student teaching. This handbook states that all student teachers are required to establish a file in the Education Placement Office at the beginning of their student teaching semester. The office provides students with information about teaching jobs as well as other positions available in the field of education. There is no fee for establishing the file, and no charge for the first five times that copies of the file are sent to prospective employers.

Interview sessions with representatives from many school districts are arranged through the placement center. The dates for these interview sessions are posted in the Placement Office. However, it is incumbent upon the registrants with the placement office to sign up for interviews as soon as interview time slots during scheduled sessions are posted.

Description of Metropolitan University. The job placement procedures offered through Metropolitan University are delineated in the Bulletin of Metropolitan University School of Education (1981). This bulletin states that the Office of Educational Placement serves two functions: (1) career counseling and assistance to students and alumni in securing professional employment; and, (2) services for graduate students related to admission to graduate programs. Placements are made primarily within Western State (pseudonym). Students are encouraged but not required to come to the placement office early in their search. The office provides assistance in

career placement as well as advisement on career advancement opportunities. Given this overview of how students are selected into and advance through the teacher education programs at the two universities participating in the RITE study, some discussion of the formal procedures for selection and initiation into the roles of cooperating teacher and university supervisor is warranted.

Selection into the Role of Supervisor

Description of State University. Supervision of student teachers at State University is carried out by both professors and teaching assistants. Teaching assistants comprise the majority of those in the university supervisor role. Requirements for the appointment of teaching assistants are outlined in the Handbook of Operating Procedures published by the Office of Graduate Studies. Teaching assistants are required to hold a Masters degree or its equivalent except in extreme circumstances. In addition, a teaching assistant must be registered as a full-time student with a grade point average of 3.0 or above. The handbook also states that teaching assistants will work with five to 12 student teachers during the course of one semester. All duties performed by teaching assistants must be under the direct supervision of a designated faculty member. In addition once university supervisors are selected, the Director of the Office of Field Experience will designate a coordinator to guide their work. The coordinator is to serve as a source for information and advice. University supervisors are asked to contact their coordinator as soon as possible.

Those professors who supervise student teachers at State University often (but not necessarily) end up doing so because, in the words of one, their classes "didn't make." This refers to the situation wherein insufficient numbers of university students enrolled in one or more of their courses, in turn causing the course(s) to be cancelled. When that occurs, a professor's

work load may be balanced by the Dean of the College of Education through the assignment of supervisory duties with an appropriate number of student teachers. Note that none of State University's supervisors are salaried or selected through the public school district.

Description of Metropolitan University. The process involved in the selection of the university supervisors at Metropolitan University is delineated in a school district publication entitled Teacher Education Guidelines (1975). It explains that the university supervisor is selected by both the district and the teacher education institution.

Some of the basic requirements and desirable qualifications which are considered in the selection of a coordinator are the following: a valid teaching credential, permanent status in the Urban Unified School District, competency and experience in teaching for at least five years, service as a cooperating teacher or demonstration teacher, a master's or other advanced degree, ability to teach methods courses, knowledge of pupils' special needs, and ability to work effectively with district and community personnel and pupils.

The following selection procedure is detailed in the guidelines and paraphrased here:

1. A five-member committee (three from the teacher training institution and two from the district) evaluates the training and experience of all candidates meeting the minimum requirements. The evaluation consists of a preliminary appraisal based on the information contained in the applications, references, and personnel files.
2. A five-member personal qualifications committee (three from the teacher training institution and two from the district) interviews the most successful candidates.

3. A list of available and acceptable candidates is compiled, based on these ratings. The list remains active for two years.
4. The coordinator candidate is selected cooperatively from the list by the district and the teacher education institution.
5. The actual assignment is made from the list by the district and the teacher education institution in accordance with the contractual agreement between the district and the university or college as approved by the Board of Education. The contractual agreement stipulates that the teacher training institution will assume financial responsibility for 60% of the coordinator's salary, fringe benefits, and mileage, while the district assumes 40%.
6. Once the actual assignment is made, the district and the teacher education institution continue their close working relationship.

Given this understanding of the quite different selection processes applied to university supervisors at each site, a review of their responsibilities (with an eye towards their similarities) is in order.

Description of Student Teaching Responsibilities of State University Supervisors

The responsibilities of the university supervisor are specified in two sources, The Handbook for University Student Teaching Supervisors (1979), and Student Teaching in Lakeview (published by the Lakeview Independent School District, 1978). Four major areas are covered in each publication: the orientation of the student teacher; the observation/feedback procedures; evaluation procedures; and, the nature of the role of the university supervisor.

Orientation. The university supervisor is required to hold an orientation meeting for all student teachers under his/her supervision. At

this time, the supervisor is expected to disseminate information regarding the student teaching program, the school and any course requirements. In the secondary and all-level (K-12) areas, the orientation meeting will likely be conducted by the area coordinator (e.g., a faculty member specializing in Mathematics Education, for instance). The kindergarten and elementary student teachers are provided with a general orientation meeting conducted by the Director of Student Field Experiences, followed by an initial seminar conducted by their individual supervisors. The following suggestions for the orientation meeting are stipulated in the Handbook for University Student Teaching Supervisors (1979, paraphrased here):

1. Supervisors should check the roll of the student teachers assigned to the seminar. They are to notify the Director of Student Field Experiences if any student teachers do not attend and return their applications to the Office of Student Field Experiences. All-level and secondary supervisors may give this information to their coordinator for handling.
2. Supervisors should provide a brief opportunity for the student teachers to introduce themselves and talk to each other. They should then introduce themselves and tell the students about their backgrounds. A feeling of friendliness and support should be communicated.
3. Students should be furnished with a copy of the supervisor's schedule which clearly indicates days and times of availability for office hours and appointments, times and places for seminars, likely visitation days, telephone numbers where he/she can be reached, and the telephone numbers of the coordinator and the Director of Student Field Experiences.
4. Supervisors should pass out cards to each student teacher to obtain names, addresses, telephone numbers, and their schedules. This information can be added to corresponding information secured from the

supervising teachers and distributed to all student teachers, principals, and supervising teachers. In the case of elementary student teachers, the school address, phone number, the name of the principal(s), and the names of the secretaries should probably be included.

5. Supervisors need to review university and school policies and procedures which will affect the student teachers.

6. Students should be asked to write brief autobiographies which can be given to their supervising teachers.

7. Transportation problems need to be resolved.

8. Supervisors should review their responsibilities, as well as those of the supervising teachers and the student teachers as listed in the handbook. Any particular procedures students should use in fulfilling their obligations (e.g., lesson plans, absences, etc.) need to be discussed.

9. General plans for seminars should be outlined. Supervisors need to recognize that early seminars should relate directly to the immediate concerns of the student teachers.

10. Supervisors are asked to discuss the importance of first impressions and the entry process with the student teachers, so as to facilitate the establishment of relationships with the supervising teachers.

11. Supervisors should also discuss how the student teachers wish to be regarded by their pupils. School children usually want a teacher they can respect, who values each one of them, who is fair, who sets reasonable limits and consistently enforces them, and who respects the pupils' feelings.

12. It is important for supervisors to discuss the necessity of the

student teachers' being considerate of the people with whom they will be working. While they may not agree with school policies or the supervising teacher's policies; procedures, and methods, it is their responsibility initially to fit into the existing structure. When they have established a good rapport with teachers and students and have demonstrated competence and tact, then most supervising teachers will give them the freedom to be innovative and explore their own ways of doing things. This flexibility, however, must be earned. They cannot expect it to be "handed to them."

13. Supervisors need to review the assessment instrument which will be used in student teacher evaluations, and discuss their particular expectations.

14. Supervisors must discuss particular course requirements. They are asked to include statements about:

    (a) the requirement to have TB test results on file in the Office of Student Field Experiences before student teachers enter their placements;

    (b) the requirement that they open a placement file in the Education Placement Center; and,

    (c) each student teacher must furnish the supervisor with an "Admission to Candidacy" card (e.g., documentation of having qualified for student teaching). If they do not have one, they must go to the Education Office and get one. This is a prerequisite for the course which the instructor must check.

15. Supervisors are asked to remind student teachers about the option of joining the State Student Education Association, or the possibility of securing some liability insurance on their own.

Observation. The Handbook for University Student Teaching Supervisors (1979) notes that regular observation of the student teacher, followed by feedback, is the most important function of a supervisor at State University. Observations and feedback serve as vehicles for both process evaluation and the instruction of student teachers. The following guidelines for observations are provided in the manual (paraphrased here):

1. Frequency--The generally accepted frequency of observation is once a week, with few exceptions. For those student teachers on half-semester programs such as kindergarten and special education, observations will be more frequent (approximately six per month). In some secondary programs, student teachers may be assigned to several schools with the same supervisor; in this case the frequency of observations may be somewhat lower. In no case should observations be made less often than every other week. Supervisors who feel that this is not a reasonable requirement should discuss their situations with the Director of Student Field Experiences.
2. Scheduling--It is sometimes desirable to schedule observations with the student teacher. This allows the student teacher to anticipate the supervisor's presence and he/she can plan carefully for that particular lesson. In general, this provides an opportunity for supervisors to see the student teachers doing their best work. It is equally important for supervisors to observe their student teachers without having scheduled the observation beforehand. In this way the supervisors are likely to see the student teachers as they usually teach.
3. Records--The university provides supervisors with forms to be used for this purpose. The forms are in triplicate, with no carbon paper

needed, and include copies for the student teacher, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor. The supervisor's record of the observations should be anecdotal in nature. The anecdotal records should include descriptions of specific behaviors and be non-evaluative in tone. Because the records form the basis of the feedback sessions, supervisors should record what transpired in context, avoiding vague generalities. An appendix is provided in the handbook with examples of statements. Cooperating teachers need to be provided with records of both the observation and corresponding feedback forms.

4. Contents--Items focused on by the supervisor during an observation should be partly determined during the previous feedback session. Identification of behaviors in a feedback session is a means of determining which events are to be recorded and which may be filtered out, because it is impossible to record everything that transpires. In addition, supervisors should observe an instructional behavior without the prior knowledge of the student teacher. For example, if the supervisor wished to focus on the cognitive level of questions generally asked by the student teacher, he/she would not inform him/her of this beforehand, so that baseline frequencies could be obtained. When choosing behaviors to observe, supervisors should restrict the observation to a very few (one to three) identified or "target" behaviors. There are several reasons for this: first, the student teacher will be able to focus on only one or two classroom behaviors for improvement at any one time; and secondly, this is also likely the supervisor's limit, in terms of recording information in an anecdotal record.

Evaluation. The Handbook for University Student Teaching Supervisors (1979) outlines the purpose and mechanics of the final student teaching evaluation. The purpose of the final evaluation is twofold: it should inform the student of his/her progress in student teaching and communicate to hiring officials the adequacy of the student teacher's performance in the classroom. Supervisors are therefore asked to make evaluations as accurate and realistic as possible. In particular, they are warned against inflated marks on the rating scale portion of the evaluation forms.

Role of university supervisor as liaison. The following guidelines for a working relationship with the supervisors' schools are also stated in the Handbook for University Student Teaching Supervisors (1979, paraphrased for brevity):

1. University supervisors should recognize that colleagues in the field are competent professionals, and respect their judgment accordingly.
2. The supervisor's primary role in the school is to work with students in the State University teacher education program. Supervisors are instructed to not try to improve the instruction being provided by the classroom teacher; coinciding with this is the admonition that it would be inappropriate for supervisors to "observe" teachers or offer suggestions about their teaching.
3. Supervisors are reminded that it is unethical to gossip or to discuss the inadequacies of people (student teachers, cooperating teachers, or others) with other people.
4. Supervisors should not use their other responsibilities on the university campus as an excuse to not fulfill their supervisory responsibilities.

5. Supervisors are instructed to never violate the principle of avoiding decisions which would be harmful or detrimental in any way to the pupils in the classrooms.

The supervisor is also expected to serve as a liaison between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher. The school district booklet entitled Student Teaching in Lakeview (1978) states that the university supervisor must do the following in order to fulfill his/her obligation toward that role:

1. Meet with prospective cooperating teachers prior to student teachers' arrival.
2. Provide each cooperating teacher with an up-to-date autobiography of the assigned student teacher.
3. Clarify each student teacher's role in the school.
4. Assist with content-oriented problems by serving as a resource for both the cooperating teacher and the student teacher.
5. Schedule and conduct at least two three-way conferences between each triad of student teacher, university supervisor, and cooperating teacher.

Description of Student Teaching Responsibilities of Supervisors at Metropolitan University

Unlike State University, there is little printed information available with regard to the Metropolitan University supervisor's role in the orientation of student teachers, the provision of observation and feedback to student teachers, and the final evaluations. However, detailed information is provided in the Teacher Education Guidelines (1975) with regard to the supervisor's role as a liaison. Available information on these topics will be reviewed.

Orientation, observation and feedback, and final evaluations. The Teacher Education Guidelines (1975) refer to an initial orientation meeting with all student teachers. Information regarding school placement and university policies is disseminated at this time. Although the term "observation" is not directly used, this publication does state that the supervisor will provide "direct supervision of classroom instruction by student teachers" (p. 18). In addition supervisors are required to assist student teachers in their self-evaluation of progress.

Role of university supervisor as liaison. The Teacher Education Guidelines (1975) specifically state that the university supervisor will serve as the liaison between participating schools and the institution he/she represents. The following responsibilities are described (paraphrased here):

1. Under the direction of the principal, supervisors will aid schools in conducting staff development programs; organize and conduct a school program for the inservice education of cooperating teachers, including on-site seminars, workshops, group conferences, and presentations of reports, lectures, and demonstrations.
2. Supervisors are expected to assist school administrators by communicating the results of research and other new developments that may be utilized to improve teacher education programs.
3. Supervisors will identify talented new teachers for possible employment in the district.
4. The supervisors should arrange for the assignment of student teachers with the input of school administrators.
5. Additionally, in cooperation with school administrators, the supervisors are expected to organize observation-participation programs and make provisions for teaching demonstrations as a

supplement to the university students' courses in curriculum and instruction.

6. Supervisors should identify school resources for use by the teacher education institution, and report to that institution information concerning newly developed programs of instruction and experimental programs.
7. Supervisors need to orient particular cooperating teachers to the evaluation procedures used by the particular teacher education institution, and will evaluate the performance of student teachers together with cooperating teachers.
8. Supervisors are expected to provide university or college resources for use by the cooperating teachers.
9. Supervisors are asked to encourage cooperating teachers within a given school, and in different schools, to share programs of instruction that they have developed.

With regard to the supervisor's role as a liaison between the student teacher and cooperating teacher, the following guidelines are offered (again, paraphrased here):

1. Supervisors are responsible for orienting the cooperating teacher to his/her role and responsibilities in working with individual student teachers or with a team of supervising teachers and student teachers.
2. Supervisors will assist the cooperating teachers in establishing a process for the analysis and improvement of instruction planned and performed by student teachers.

3. It is expected that supervisors will respond positively to requests from the cooperating teachers for services or assistance with student teachers.

Discussion of Student Teaching Responsibilities at the Two Sites

It should be obvious to the reader that there are dramatic differences in the guidelines furnished by both the participating universities and school districts to supervisors of student teachers. For example, publications from one site (State) specify that supervisors are not to interact with cooperating teachers for the purpose of critiquing or improving their teaching; materials from the other site (Metropolitan) heavily emphasize the supervisors' role as providers of professional growth experiences to both inservice and preservice teachers. Also, State University offers a number of "how-to's" (e.g., passing out note cards to obtain phone numbers, etc.), while the other leaves the mechanics of the supervisor's role in regard to the student teachers, more open to individual interpretation.

Perhaps the issue of specificity/generality in stated role functions is reflective of the caliber and capacity of persons working as supervisors at the two sites (mostly graduate students versus highly experienced full-time supervisors). It is not possible, however, to make a definite determination of how these differences impact either the student teachers as individuals, or the preservice clinical experience as a collective, programmatic entity (and the implications of these for the teaching profession). In turning to an examination of the selection and role specifications of cooperating teachers at the two sites, it will be interesting to note if the apparent trend of differences in formal processes is maintained.

Description of Requirements for Selection as a Cooperating Teacher

State University. The following criteria for the selection of cooperating teachers is outlined in Student Teaching In Lakeview (1978), a handbook published by the Lakeview School District:

1. Holds a bachelor's degree.
2. Is certified in the area in which he/she is teaching.
3. Has at least one year of teaching experience.
4. Expresses the desire to have a student teacher.
5. Is cooperative in his/her professional relationships.
6. Is committed to student teaching as a professional growth experience.
7. Is willing to give time to the student teacher.
8. See himself/herself as a lifetime learner.
9. Demonstrates effective classroom teaching.
10. Seeks new methods and materials.
11. Is flexible in his/her program.
12. Will allow the student teacher opportunities for innovative teaching.

In addition the handbook delineates the following steps for the selection of cooperating teachers (paraphrased here):

1. Teachers should receive, sign and return application forms to their principals; these are forwarded to the Office of Staff Development and Student Teaching.
2. The Office of Staff Development and Student Teaching compiles a Master Assignment Sheet for each campus in the District.
3. Tentative assignment of student teachers is coordinated through the college/university office of field experiences and the District Office of Staff Development and Student Teaching.

4. Principals are contacted by the university supervisors for their approval and necessary signatures.
5. Supervisors then arrange for student teachers to visit their school buildings and meet their principals and supervising teachers.

Metropolitan University. Metropolitan University's cooperating teachers must also meet certain selection standards. The following criteria are outlined in the Teacher Education Guidelines (1975) handbook published by Urban Unified School District:

1. Effective teaching skills.
2. Sound philosophy of education based upon knowledge of growth and development of pupils.
3. Understanding of and commitment to the educational goals of the district, administrative area, and school.
4. Ability to relate well to others.
5. Willingness to examine, evaluate, and improve his or her own teaching.
6. Interest in teacher education and a desire and ability to serve in a supervisory role.

This handbook also stipulates that the principal of each school involved in the student teaching program shall work in cooperation with one university supervisor on the selection and assignment of cooperating teachers and student teachers.

Cooperating Teacher Role Orientation and Responsibilities

Description of State University. Cooperating teachers are provided with a handbook specifically designed to help orient them to their roles and responsibilities. This handbook, Guiding Student Teachers: A Manual for the Supervising Teachers in the State University Student Teaching Program (1979),

delineates the responsibilities of the university supervisor, the cooperating teacher and the student teacher; outlines university policies with regard to student teaching; and provides the cooperating teacher with suggestions for organizing his/her responsibilities. The following responsibilities (paraphrased for brevity) of the cooperating teacher are outlined in the handbook. A supervising teacher will:

1. Accept the student teacher as a professional.
2. Acquaint the student teacher with appropriate school policies, personnel, materials, resources, and special programs.
3. Allow the student teacher to assume responsibility as his/her readiness permits.
4. Encourage the student teacher to be creative and try new teaching strategies.
5. Require lesson plans from the student teacher prior to his/her teaching.
6. Observe the student teacher instructing the class on a regular basis (at least weekly) and provide written notes to both the student teacher and university supervisor.
7. Provide an organized feedback session for each observation, together with a written summary of the session results to both the student teacher and the supervisor (this need not be to the exclusion of notes taken by the student teacher).
8. Conduct regular cooperative planning sessions with the student teacher (a minimum of one each week).
9. Complete a student teaching assessment form at the end of the semester and discuss it with the student teacher. There should also be a mid-semester conference in which the student teacher is

informed of his/her level of proficiency and is offered concrete suggestions for improvement.

10. Attend inservice meetings conducted for cooperating teachers.

In addition the Lakeview School District outlines the role of the cooperating teacher in the handbook, Student Teaching in Lakeview (1978). It states that the cooperating teacher should do the following when working with a student teacher (also paraphrased):

1. Recognize that the professional and legal responsibility of the classroom remains in the hands of the regular teacher.
2. Accept the student teacher as a fellow professional.
3. Help the student teacher accept each child as a unique individual.
4. Plan with the student teacher the steps in assuming classroom responsibilities, and allow the student teacher to assume more responsibility as he/she exhibits readiness to do so.
5. Demonstrate effective teaching.
6. Encourage the student teacher to be creative and try new teaching strategies.
7. Plan for periodic evaluations with major emphasis on continuous growth.

Discussion. Notice the high degree of similarity in the items obtained from the two different sources. While there is reliability or consensus across the formal processes of the two organizations, however, the operationalization of several items (e.g., demonstrate effective teaching, accept the student teacher as a professional) is left open-ended. Therefore the informal processes impacting cooperating teachers in Lakeview may be a significant source of variation in the way they define the role. Compare this

situation with the guidelines provided by Metropolitan University and the Urban School District.

Description of Metropolitan University. In a similar effort to orient the cooperating teachers to their roles and responsibilities, the Urban Unified School District provides each cooperating teacher with a handbook entitled Teacher Education Guidelines (1975). The following responsibilities (paraphrased for brevity) are delineated, such that the cooperating teachers will:

1. Safeguard the welfare of their students by maintaining an acceptable instructional program at all times.
2. Perform all regular classroom duties under the direction of the principal.
3. Acquaint the student teacher with the school, the school faculty and staff and the pupils.
4. Provide the student teacher with copies of all texts, manuals, school bulletins and forms.
5. Attempt to establish the student teacher as a leader in the classroom.
6. Observe the student teacher, record all observations in detail and provide feedback to the student teacher at weekly conferences.
7. Evaluate the performance of the student teacher.
8. Confer with the university supervisor frequently to provide him/her with informed evaluations of the student teacher's progress.
9. Participate in inservice education classes and professional meetings dealing with the supervision of student teachers.

Discussion. In conclusion, there would appear to be a fair amount of similarity in the responsibilities that both school districts and universities

have designated as belonging to cooperating teachers. The overall thrust is clearly one of shared professionalism in the classroom, intended to promote student teachers' application of instructional and management skills to some satisfactory level of autonomous functioning. Again, the similarity across sites as well as organizations in the guidelines' contents is simultaneously remarkable (as evidence of their practical validity) yet distressing (due to the absence of operational definitions for many of the items). Because of this lack of precision, the significance of informal processes in the conduct of student teaching roles can be paramount. These will be discussed in the next two major sections of this report.

Informal Organizational Properties of Universities

Note that while formal guidelines are established to govern student teaching, the informal, day-to-day interactions among the participants within their particular settings must be examined to acquire a more accurate description of student teaching. This section of the report will discuss the informal processes of the university related to student teaching in the specific areas of placement and grievances. Following the discussion of informal processes of the university, a description of those informal processes related specifically to the university supervisors will be presented.

Informal Organizational Properties Related to Placement of Student Teachers

Description of State University. Prior to the arrival of student teachers, classroom teachers are selected as cooperating teachers. Consistent with the formal guidelines set forth by the Lakeview School District and the State University, most of the cooperating teachers interviewed indicated that they had volunteered for the role. However, they reported having been selected from the pool of volunteers by their principal. Whether this was a

reflection of lack of awareness of the Lakeview central administration's involvement, as well as the university's, or a simple report that the principal was the person who conveyed the information directly to the teachers, is unknown. The majority of cooperating teachers considered being selected an honor.

Following the selection of cooperating teachers, student teachers are assigned to classrooms. According to the study participants, placement of student teachers tended to vary with the individuals involved, despite the formal description of control by the Director of the Office of Student Field Experiences. Some student teachers indicated meeting with their school principal prior to being assigned to a teacher; in these meetings, principals attempted to effectively match student and cooperating teachers by determining the student teachers' basic philosophies with regard to instruction. Some university supervisors also indicated meeting with principals to determine placement of student teachers. One supervisor stated that she had asked her student teachers fill out questionnaires; these were shared with the principal. The two then worked together to effectively match cooperating teachers with student teachers.

Discussion. In sum, although procedures have been outlined in university publications as to how student teachers will be placed in the Lakeview schools, there is apparently considerable slippage from the printed word. This is not in any way intended to be a negative portrayal of the conduct of State University's preservice clinical teacher education component; such deviations could easily (but not necessarily) benefit student teachers through the increased flexibility and personal knowledge brought to bear upon the decision-making process by the local administrators' and supervisors' cooperative efforts.

Description of Metropolitan University. Cooperating teachers in the Urban School District tended to report having been selected through formal procedures. They indicated that three steps were generally involved: (1) preparing a sample lesson for the selection committee; (2) meeting with the selection committee; and (3) obtaining the building principal's recommendation. Three cooperating teachers admitted, however, that they had obtained a student teacher without going through the selection process (in one of these, no request for a student teacher had ever been made by the teacher --she was just given a note which forewarned the student teacher's impending arrival).

Following the selection of cooperating teachers, student teachers are assigned to individual schools. University supervisors (recall they are also assigned to schools) reported meeting as a group to determine student teacher placements. Because Metropolitan's supervisors are responsible for several kinds of preservice experiences, such as the observation courses, they typically have some prior knowledge of the student teachers' backgrounds and possible preferences. This is apparently not the case at State University, where largely different faculty and teaching assistants are responsible for observation blocks, student teaching, and so on.

Description of Grievance Procedures

Student teachers and cooperating teachers at both State University and Metropolitan University approach problems with the student teaching experience in a similar fashion. The majority of student teachers at both sites report turning first to their university supervisors and then to their cooperating teachers when problems arise (this is largely consistent with the formal processes already reviewed). Few indicated turning toward friends, parents or various support groups in their responses to interview questions. Similarly,

most cooperating teachers said they would turn to the university supervisor for advice when problems arise. A few reported speaking directly to the student teacher and/or the building principal.

On the other hand, university supervisors responded to the interview questions by saying they would first turn to their peers for consultation. Following advice from their colleagues, some reported that they would go directly to the cooperating teacher involved. Few would contact university administrators, although the latter were acknowledged by at least one supervisor as an authority to be relied upon in extreme situations. Because of the complexity of the role, a closer examination of informal organizational properties as they relate specifically to the supervisors is warranted.

Informal Organizational Properties of the Universities Relating to the University Supervisor

Several informal processes may influence the manner in which university supervisors enter, organize, and carry out their roles. These processes include selection requirements for university supervisors, orientation of the university supervisors to their role, their responsibilities during student teaching, and the support and reward systems that relate to that job.

Description of selection requirements and process. Despite the existence of formal requirements and guidelines for use in selecting university supervisors, decisions regarding who became a university supervisor often depended upon relatively mundane considerations. Three of the five university supervisors at State University were graduate students who had applied for appointments as income-producing adjuncts to their education. One commented that supervising student teachers took less time and had a less intense pace than instruction in a regular university classroom (another option for graduate students). Another State supervisor mentioned the flexible working

day as the primary reason for becoming a university supervisor. On the other hand, the supervisors at Metropolitan University mentioned positive attributes associated with the job when asked why they became university supervisors. They saw supervising as a way to contribute to their profession and work with adult learners. They were often recognized as "master teachers" themselves before being recommended, screened, and tested for the university supervisor position.

When asked about their training for the position, university supervisors indicated a wide variety of experiences. One State University supervisor reported no special training while another mentioned teaching in public school classrooms as the only training received. Other supervisors referred to administrative experience (as a principal, or as a director of teacher aides) and prior supervision experience at other institutions when asked about their training. Three supervisors did report taking classes in supervision, although two had done so to receive an administrative credential rather than to improve skills directly related to student teaching. Eight of the supervisors did feel they could benefit from some further training, specifically in interpersonal relations, observation techniques, and/or new classroom techniques to share with their student teachers. Some also felt they could benefit from receiving more information about the requirements of other universities with student teachers in the area schools, and from exchanging ideas among other university supervisors and faculty. Two supervisors at State felt that the job was mainly one of mediation and problem-solving and required little more than common sense.

Discussion of selection requirements and process. Since few university supervisors reported specific training for their jobs, one might expect supervisors to acquire skills through alternate learning modes. One possible

mode could be modeling, considered by many to be a powerful teaching technique (e.g., Bandura, 1969). The university supervisors often mentioned the importance of selecting cooperating teachers who were good role models for the student teachers, yet they rarely had opportunities themselves to observe other university supervisors who might serve as their own role models. Five supervisors could not recall ever observing university supervisors work with student teachers while three said they rarely did so. As a consequence the university supervisors admittedly based their conceptions of the effective university supervisor on second-hand knowledge, and overwhelmingly described that ideal in terms of personal characteristics, such as compassion or being confident, rather than in terms of supervisory skills and behaviors. The lack of observation of potential role models by university supervisors may have implications for their job performances; these will be discussed at a later point in this paper.

Description of orientation to the role of university supervisor. In practice the responsibilities of the university supervisors were much more extensive than a reading of formal guidelines would imply. While the supervisors recognized the importance of their administrative functions, they tended to emphasize the human, personal aspects of the role. University supervisors most often mentioned informal sources when asked how they became aware of their role and responsibilities. These informal sources included support systems formed by association with other supervisors, and often the idiosyncratic priorities of the individual supervisor based on previous experience as a student teacher or "what I've arrived at myself." Heavy reliance upon informal orientation to the role and responsibilities carries with it the possibility that the conception formed will be incorrect (as one

supervisor said, "Who knows? I may have been doing the wrong thing all the time!").

The perceptions formed by university supervisors of their role and responsibilities were interesting and varied. As would be expected, they saw their role as "supervising" rather than "teaching" when their responses were categorized with the five coding categories defined by the RITE staff for qualitative data (see pp. 5-6 of this report). They described their role as (a) serving as a middle person, mediator, or liaison between the public schools and the university, (b) providing clear expectations, objective descriptions, and informal and formal evaluations of student teachers' performances, while also (c) serving as a security blanket for those same student teachers. They assumed the responsibility of offering suggestions or communicating requirements (both their own and those of the university) to structure the activities and experiences of the student teachers, attempting simultaneously to maintain a positive environment for all concerned. A breakdown in communication between and among all participants--even those more remotely concerned with the day-to-day activities like principals or parents of classroom students--was considered a major problem and a negative reflection on the skills of the university supervisor. For this reason the supervisors indicated that making themselves available either in person or by telephone at <u>all</u> times, and having cooperating teachers, student teachers, and principals aware of this availability were extremely important. In fact, six of the nine university supervisors reported spending more time on their jobs than their job descriptions suggested even though cooperating teachers and student teachers often desired more time and attention from them. Especially at State University, where three of the five supervisors were also graduate students taking nine graduate hours necessary to meet job qualifications,

these desires for more time were prevalent. At the same time the cooperating teachers and student teachers often expressed an understanding attitude toward the demands and pressures on the university supervisors.

Description of assignment to student teachers and to schools. Another area of student teaching where the informal system often impacts is in the assignment of the student teachers to particular schools and cooperating teachers. Given various studies (Hoy & Rees, 1977; Poole, 1972; and Pruitt & Lee, 1978) supporting the importance of placement context upon the student teachers' performance, one would expect some attention to be given to this factor by the university supervisors. Information related to this segment of the student teaching experience was gained indirectly from the interviews. The supervisors at State University, possibly by virtue of their part-time, non-permanent status, seemed to have little influence upon the placement process, or even their own assignment to particular schools. In contrast the Metropolitan supervisors made attempts to become acquainted with teacher education students prior to the beginning of the student teaching experience for the purpose of "assessing limitations and strengths and trying to place them in assignments that (would) be most meaningful and helpful to them." One supervisor, who heard via the grapevine that a student teacher was displeased with his/her placement, immediately contacted the student teacher and offered to make a change. Such a change could probably be effected more easily when supervisors have had long-established ties with the public schools and their respective faculties and principals, and the alternatives that these ties allowed, than by more transient supervisors whose contacts in the schools were more restricted. The State supervisors could request changes, but the process involved extra administrative work with their superiors and a consequent loss of precious time.

Description of student teaching responsibilities. A fourth area where the informal processes of the universities influenced the student teaching experience was that of the university supervisor's specific responsibilities. These included providing information, orientations, observations, feedback, and evaluations to the student teachers, in addition to serving as liaison between the student teacher and the cooperating teacher and liaison between the university and the public school system.

Although 16 of the 20 intensive sample student teachers acknowledged having attended some type of orientation meeting held by the university, six remarked that they were still unclear about their role in the schools and the requirements of student teaching. Ten student teachers credited the university supervisor with providing more specific guidelines than information obtained through the orientations, in what was usually termed "pacing guides." Two student teachers (one from each site) reported not having received any written guidelines prior to the experience. None of the student teachers specifically stated that the role was made clear before embarking upon the experience. One, in fact, stated that the university emphasized the guest status of the student teacher while the public school principal emphasized the full faculty status of the student teacher during the local building orientation. Clearly, some problems existed in the orientation phase of student teaching for some student teachers.

That a problematic orientation process was irritating or frustrating to student teachers is evidenced through the affective statements they made. One State University student teacher responded to the interview question by saying, "I do have some gripes in that area..."; another described the State University elementary student teachers' orientation thusly: "It was terrible ... 300 people in the auditorium for four hours one morning. They tried to

explain everything, everything was thrown at you." It seems unfortunate for the student teachers that they are not uniformly provided with adequate information, and that the information blockage in turn may lead to frustration, anxiety, and resentment at the beginning of such a critical experience.

Description of observation responsibilities. From the viewpoints of almost everyone directly involved with student teaching, one of the prime responsibilities of the university supervisor was to observe and provide feedback to the student teachers on their performances. When asked to describe an effective university supervisor, cooperating teachers emphasized the need for someone capable of maintaining open communications among the participants, who also specified expectations early in the semester, made themselves available, and made frequent visits to the classroom.

While there was some variation in the number of observations made by university supervisors (from two per week to one every two to three weeks), most student teachers accurately expected weekly observations. A definite difference was noted between the accuracy of student teacher expectations at the two sites. All student teachers at State University expected weekly observations, and their supervisors met this expectation. In contrast only one university supervisor at Metropolitan University had communicated in such a manner that the student teachers could accurately estimate the expected frequency of observations (one every two weeks). In another case, student teachers expected weekly observations while the university supervisor intended to make observations every two to three weeks. In yet another case the student teachers had no idea of how often the supervisor would observe, while the supervisor intended to make weekly observations.

Discussion of observation responsibilities. A part of the problem of mismatch between expectations and actual numbers of observations may be due to differences in terminology. Many Metropolitan University supervisors mentioned making "visits" to the classroom or "passing through" the classroom as well as making observations. The visits were very informal, brief, and apparently intended to quickly ascertain "how things were going." The function of these visits was apparently to keep lines of communication open and put in an appearance to demonstrate availability. The university supervisors also felt that short, frequent visits were enough to give them a sense of the adequacy of the student teacher's performance. While the university supervisors perceived themselves as frequently visiting, the student teachers discounted these visits since little observation, diagnosis, or feedback of benefit to them resulted. To student teachers observation apparently implied an activity lasting twenty to thirty minutes that resulted in some written record of the student teachers' performance, possibly some evaluative comments from which the student teacher could gauge his/her strengths and weaknesses, plan alternatives and, finally, measure personal progress. Five student teachers at State University and three at Metropolitan University stated that the university supervisors could have been more helpful to them if they had made more and longer observations as well as observations of different subjects held at various times of day in the classroom. Some of the student teachers felt that the university supervisors had not spent (or been able to spend) enough time observing to get an accurate indication of the student teachers' teaching abilities. The cooperating teachers also echoed this feeling, although to a lesser degree. They were more aware and forgiving of the many demands upon the time of the supervisors, especially the graduate students at State.

Description of conference responsibilities. One of the most noticeable differences between the sites occurred in the frequency, style, and substance of the feedback given the student teachers regarding their performance. Student teachers at State University had expectations of weekly individual conferences which were met. These were not necessarily prescheduled throughout the semester, but occurred either spontaneously (usually immediately after the observation) or at a later scheduled time. In contrast, only one university supervisor - student teacher dyad at Metropolitan University coincided in their perceptions of the frequency of conferences (weekly). Three supervisors at Metropolitan University each had at least one student teacher who had no idea how often conferences would occur. Two pairs of university supervisors and student teachers were mismatched in their expectations with the student teachers in each case expecting conferencing more often than university supervisors. Again it appears that the Metropolitan University supervisors were not as successful in communicating the mechanics of the preservice clinical experience to their students as were the State University supervisors.

Discussion of conference responsibilities. Again the apparent differences may be related to the structure of the student teaching programs. State University supervisors were formally required to hold feedback sessions after an observation, while it does not appear that Metropolitan University supervisors were required to do so. The latter group tended to meet with student teachers for conferences on an as-needed basis rather than regularly. In addition the Metropolitan University supervisors each taught the university methods classes which the student teachers took concurrently with their classroom experience. Only one State University supervisor was teaching a concurrent methods class, although all State University supervisors were

required to hold weekly seminars for their respective student teachers. The Metropolitan University supervisors in particular tended to depend upon these regularly scheduled class meetings to make contact with individual student teachers before and after the classes. These contacts may have served the feedback function of the more formal conferences associated with State University supervisors.

Description of feedback content. University supervisors also differed on the substance of the feedback they provided. Student teachers as a group reported emphasis on lesson plans, although individuals mentioned a wide variety of other subjects such as helpful ideas for presenting lessons. Five student teachers could not remember receiving any specific helpful feedback. The major difference between the sites was in the apparent degree of satisfaction experienced by the student teacher in relation to the helpfulness of the university supervisors' feedback. Seven student teachers at Metropolitan University felt that all of the feedback given by the university supervisor was helpful, while only one student teacher at State University was equally satisfied. Some student teachers at State University felt that some of the university supervisors made suggestions which did not apply to their particular class settings, due to the supervisor's unfamiliarity with the school. Others felt that the style of observation (anecdotal record), feedback (self analysis), and/or conferencing (broad, open-ended questions) was not helpful. Several requested more sharing of teaching ideas by the university supervisor.

Discussion of feedback content. When examining the subjects discussed during feedback sessions, no apparent systematic differences were found between Metropolitan and State University supervisors which would account for the difference in satisfaction. However, Metropolitan University student

teachers more often mentioned affective behaviors of the supervisor like encouragement and support. This positive affect, rather than any substantive differences, appeared to be an important component of the university supervisor's role which contributed to student teacher satisfaction.

It is also possible that the "reinforcement schedule" upon which the Metropolitan student teachers were placed caused them to value the supervisors' feedback relatively more than the State student teachers. To explain this, assume for a moment that student teachers generally find personal attention (in the form of visits or observations) from university supervisors to be highly rewarding. Learning theory and research informs one that variable reinforcement schedules (e.g., those which are least predictable) with highly rewarding events lead to the most persistent behaviors (see, for example, Ferster & Skinner, 1957). In addition, dissonance theory (Festinger, 1961) indicates that events which have a high cost (in terms of money, work, etc.) and constitute a relatively low payoff are going to be valued more than they would be under different (less costly) circumstances. Thus, the Metropolitan student teachers are receiving unpredictable and brief visits from their supervisors (a variable reinforcement schedule) which lead to relatively high and constant levels of anticipation, preparation, etc. (a high cost in terms of energy and effort); it would be logical from dissonance theory to expect these student teachers to find "everything" their supervisors said to be helpful and favorably viewed (i.e., with positive affect). Conversely, the Lakeview student teachers were on predictable, fixed interval (once a week) reinforcement schedules, such that even though the content of supervisory contacts did not appear to differ, the value placed upon them and the affect associated with them could differ.

Given this somewhat unusual interpretation of supervision, the final payoff--the student teachers' final evaluations--needs to be examined.

Description of evaluation. Another major responsibility of the university supervisor was to evaluate the performance of the student teacher. Most university supervisors simply used the university-provided forms and adopted implicitly the criteria therein. Supervisors at both universities held mid-semester and end-of-semester evaluations with the student teachers; however, only at State University was inclusion of the cooperating teacher in a conference with the other two participants required.

Regardless of the criteria contained on the evaluation form, university supervisors concentrated on different aspects of student teachers' performances, based on their perceptions of their student teachers' needs or occasionally on the personal preferences of the supervisors. In the overall evaluation a heavy emphasis was placed by university supervisors on classroom and behavioral management, followed by teaching skills, rapport with students, and evidence of classroom students' learning. When evaluating a particular lesson after observation, however, the university supervisors reported a different focus. When asked how they judged the success of an individual lesson, university supervisors responded most often that it depended on the student teachers' rapport with the pupils. The responses given with the next greatest frequencies were "their teaching skills" and student teacher knowledge of the academic content, respectively. The different emphases given in the various evaluations could cause problems for the student teachers if they anticipated that the same items receiving heaviest weight during individual lesson evaluations would also receive the same weight on the final evaluation. An additional problem might be discontinuity between the emphases

of the individual university supervisor and the criteria of the official evaluation forms.

As part of their evaluation function, the university supervisors often asked student teachers to evaluate their own performance. The State University supervisors encouraged the use of the "Feedback Forms" whereon the student teacher recorded strengths, weaknesses, and suggestions for improvement of the particular behaviors recorded on the "Anecdotal Record." The Metropolitan University supervisors, on the other hand, tended to ask student teachers to write an evaluation on each lesson plan, basically "how the lesson went." Supervisors at both sites reported asking student teachers to use the final evaluation forms for self-evaluation at the mid-way point and/or before the final conference. One-half of the student teachers said that their self-evaluations were congruent with the university supervisors' evaluations of them, while three student teachers said the university supervisor rated the student teacher higher than each rated him/herself. No university supervisor was reported to have rated the student teachers lower than the student teachers rated themselves. University supervisors felt strongly that "teachers must be able to evaluate themselves" and did require, or at least encourage, practice of this skill by the student teachers.

When the structure provided by evaluation forms or focused supervision is removed, however, participants in the student teaching triad do not necessarily cease to view the student teacher with evaluative eyes. To wit, neither cooperating teachers nor university supervisors failed to respond to a pair of open-ended interview questions, "What is the greatest strength of your present student teacher?" and "What is the greatest weakness of your present student teacher?" (Questions for the university supervisors were asked in reference to both their "best" and "weakest" student teachers.)

Responses to these questions were almost invariably prompt. They tended to include many references to personality characteristics and therefore were often inferential in nature. Few individuals responded by noting particular teaching behaviors or skills as either superlative or clearly inadequate. Instead, among the duplicate responses for strengths were terms such as "flexibility," "creativity," "enthusiasm," and "prepared." Duplicate responses among the descriptions of weaknesses included "overcautious" and "unprepared." The oppositions across these terms cannot escape notice: creativity and enthusiasm are not likely to be observed in someone who is overcautious, and prepared and unprepared are precise opposites.

Consistent with an apparent tendency to rely upon inferred personality/intellectual characteristics, many cooperating teachers and university supervisors used phraseology indicative of the student teachers' being child-oriented, or possessing social sensitivity. They described the student teachers' ability to "communicate at their (pupils') level" and their "sensitivity to children's needs." An additional set of responses about conduct may be related, but the teachers were less specific: their student teachers' strength was having a "lovely manner" with the children, or being "such a nice person."

Others noted the apparent motivation of their student teachers. As mentioned above, they were described as being "dedicated" and "hard working." While these terms appear to be based upon student teaching performance, specific student teacher behaviors as evidence were not generally offered.

A few teachers did speak to the instructional and behavioral management skills of their student teachers. Responses typical of the "teaching skills" theme included examples such as, "asked thought-provoking questions," "management, she took control of the class quickly," "particular skills in

teaching science," and so on. It is a bit surprising to note that the university supervisors at either site did not generate responses which meshed with this theme, with the exception of an isolated comment by one: "designed interesting methods." Even this comment does not specify what techniques, strategies, or results caused the supervisor to label the methods "interesting."

Another group of responses pertained to the student teacher's readiness or security in assuming the role of teacher. These included comments such as "the kids really respected her as a teacher," "she was very poised in the classroom," and so on. Here again, observable behaviors as evidence of readiness or security were not provided. Similar patterns were apparent in cooperating teachers' and university supervisors' description of student teachers' weaknesses as well as their strengths. Those weaknesses mentioned with the highest frequencies referred to (1) somehow deficient intellectual (particularly analytic or diagnostic) abilities, (2) insecurity, and (3) communication problems. While some cooperating teachers or supervisors were able to cite specific instances of what could reasonably be called communication problems, the other two categories included largely unsubstantiated inferential statements: "being over-cautious," "being unsure of himself," "he didn't think there was anything wrong," "her inability to see what's too much noise," "judgment," or "inability to see what's happening around her."

Beyond the responses which reflect this general concern for student teachers' intellectual and personality characteristics, cooperating teachers and supervisors were able to specify some skill or behavior areas as weaknesses in student teachers. When this was done, teachers seemed to approach identifying weaknesses with either or both of the following frames of

reference: (1) the "real" problem was simply a relative lack of experience which would be solved with increased amounts of time in the classroom, or (2) the student teacher seemed to have the requisite personal characteristics, but consistently or repeatedly erred or was inadequate in one or two relatively contained or well-defined teaching skill areas (the inadequacy was relative to the cooperating teacher's idiosyncratic standards, apparently).

Because comments fitting the first frame of reference were typically offered without elaboration, establishing subcategories through further analysis of their thematic content was not possible. However, supervisor or cooperating teacher comments which fit the second frame of reference might be labeled as falling into the broad categories of (1) instructional management, (2) time or behavioral management, and (3) preparation or planning. Here are some typical examples: "monitoring noise level and keeping kids on task," "handling problems around the room when you're involved with a child," "control, and that's [a problem] with every student teacher," "being unprepared, that upsets me," and "carelessness in areas of, like, picking worksheets to be used for assignments." Thus, individuals who are responsible for evaluating student teachers (whether university supervisors or cooperating teachers) are capable of assessing them in terms of defined teaching skill or behavior areas.

Discussion. The dilemma for the student teachers, and for the profession as a whole, would appear to be the infrequency with which such evaluations are made. This may be a bit disquieting in view of the availability of research-based knowledge of what behaviors constitute effective teaching and contribute to an image of competence and security (see, for example, Barnes, Note 11; Good, Note 12). It is also possible that comments such as "she was very poised" were made about student teachers who rarely discussed any lack of

confidence or insecurity with their cooperating teachers or supervisors, leading to the latters' belief; but no evidence is available to substantiate this.

Perhaps the very consistent response tendency reflects an underlying belief system held by both teachers and supervisors. In particular, it seems plausible that an unexpressed assumption may be operating, whereby certain traits or socially-oriented personality characteristics are perceived as being essential vehicles for the translation of teaching technology into pedagogy. Consequently, when the various skills or behaviors are being utilized successfully or at least without major problems (in the others' eyes) by the student teacher, the success is attributed to the presence of requisite personality characteristics or other inferred abilities and traits, such as social sensitivity.

Conversely, it seems that the cooperating teachers and university supervisors often attribute unsuccessful utilization of teaching skills, or failure to change teaching behaviors when that would be a successful strategy, to the students' traits rather than to their situations or to their repertoire of teaching skills and behaviors. From the perspective of the teacher educator, such a belief system could either create a wide margin of comfort in terms of the supervisor's and/or cooperating teacher's responsibility for the student teacher's performance (e.g., a cooperating teacher cannot be asked to change a student teacher's personality or intellectual abilities), or create a frustrating, "no-win" situation where the cooperating teacher's goal for student teaching is simply to endure it and hope for better "luck of the draw" in the following semesters. Neither of these would appear to be optimal perspectives for approaching a key learning experience in the professional preparation of teachers.

Description of the liaison role. Another vital role and responsibility of the university supervisors related to student teaching was that of liaison between the cooperating teacher and student teacher, between either of these participants and the public school and/or the university, and between the university and the public schools at the institutional level. One of the first communication functions of the university supervisors was to provide cooperating teachers with information about the student teaching experience intended by that university. Only six cooperating teachers mentioned specifically input by the university supervisors, who were said to provide some "booklets" or "packets" outlining the duties of the cooperating teachers. Only one cooperating teacher reported a conversation with the university supervisor orienting the cooperating teacher to his/her duties and responsibilities. Cooperating teachers apparently received most of their information from books or guidelines produced by the local district or the university and acquired by chance, through coursework at the university or routinely from the local district. Most cooperating teachers expressed positive comments on the comprehensiveness and usefulness of the books and guidelines. Several expressed a need for some orientation meetings to clarify their roles and responsibilities.

A difference between the sites was found regarding the provision of written guidelines to the cooperating teachers. Most (80%) of the cooperating teachers working with Metropolitan University mentioned having written guidelines or booklets from either the university or the local district. Only one-fifth of the cooperating teachers working with State University expressed awareness of any written guidelines. Of those who did, one used a guide idiosyncratic to the university supervisor and one used a self-designed

"pacing guide." Only one cooperating teacher mentioned using the university guidelines.

In addition to providing orientation, the university supervisors were also viewed as communicators. They often reminded participants of requirements to be fulfilled, and delivered and collected administrative paperwork. Of course, their role went beyond merely serving as a conduit of information although often their messages to student teachers and cooperating teachers were informal exchanges on a weekly basis as they "popped in and out" of the classroom. Both university supervisors and cooperating teachers reported that most exchanges were oral; those which were written were most often brief notes left in the student teachers' notebooks or on their lesson plans. These notes were often read by all participants over the course of the semester. Three cooperating teachers reported at mid-semester that they had had little or no communication with the supervisor while four reported having communicated only upon their own request.

This infrequent communication was interesting especially in light of the formally established State University observation-and-feedback system. Each observation made by cooperating teachers or university supervisors was on the "Anecdotal Record" which was printed on self-carbon paper. This resulted in three color-coded copies of each page, one each intended for the student teacher, cooperating teacher and university supervisor. The "Feedback Forms" completed by the student teacher after reading and analyzing the "Anecdotal Record" of the observation was intended to be shared. The purpose of this system was obviously to keep all participants informed of the activities and comments of the other participants, simply a communication system. The lack of references by cooperating teachers to the copies intended for them indicates some problems with the system--either they were not being used by

the participants, or they were but not seen as being very valuable by the cooperating teachers.

As a liaison between the cooperating teacher and the university, the university supervisor provided several valued services for the cooperating teacher. When asked how the university supervisor was most helpful, cooperating teachers most often mentioned serving as a resource, pacing the student teaching experience, giving guidelines for the student teacher to follow, knowing the background of the student teacher, and interpersonal support of the cooperating teacher as another team member. Cooperating teachers felt the university supervisors could have been more helpful if they had more time available, if they shared more information about the teacher education program content, if they had clearer objectives, and if they were in the classroom more often. Four of the cooperating teachers working with Metropolitan University supervisors did not feel university supervisors could have done anything to be more helpful. The other cooperating teachers working with Metropolitan University supervisors mentioned only problems related to the contextual situation such as the workload of the supervisor and the resulting lack of time. The cooperating teachers working with State University supervisors also mentioned the problem of time but additionally requested more structure and objectives from the supervisors. Thus, a site difference was seen between the satisfaction of the cooperating teachers with the university supervisors' performances. One situation during student teaching where the liaison role of the university supervisor could become critical was when a problem arose between the student teacher and the cooperating teacher. The university supervisor was mentioned most often by the cooperating teachers and the student teachers as the person to whom they would turn if a problem arose, although several other people were also

mentioned--the other partner in the classroom dyad, the principal, the university director of the student teaching program, a friend or family member(s).

Despite looking to the university supervisor for communications, observation and feedback to the student teacher, evaluation, and help with problems, the university supervisors were not seen by the cooperating teacher as exercising much influence on their work with student teachers. When asked to rate the supervisors' influence on a scale from "no influence" to "little," "moderate," "strong," or "very strong influence," five of the intensive sample cooperating teachers said there was moderate influence; another five said there was little influence. The extremes included three teachers who described the influence as strong, and three who felt supervisors exerted no influence on their work.

Student teachers did report a stronger influence for the university supervisor. Eight of them said the supervisors had a moderate influence on their work, while five described the influence as being strong and three said it was very strong. Thus, although cooperating teachers tended to be less critical of the university supervisors' performance, they did not perceive their work to be as significantly influenced by the university supervisors as the student teachers did.

On another level the university supervisors served as liaisons between the university and the public schools. The supervisors saw their role largely as one of providing communication, such as working with the building principals and keeping them informed with memos, and interpreting the requirements and expectations of the university to all district staff who might work with student teachers. On the other hand the university supervisors were kept appraised by the public school personnel of the

curriculum changes in the district and the status of various programs in the schools. Such information was available for sharing with other university personnel and for improving the preparation of university students for the public classrooms. University supervisors also served an administrative function by making all the placement arrangements; in the Urban district supervisors were additionally responsible for managing a strong demonstration program. These supervisors arranged for their entire methods classes to observe various classroom teachers presenting "demonstrations" of their teaching. The educational function provided to the university by these public school staff members was highly valued by student teachers, who often felt these were among the most helpful experiences of their preservice education.

A last important liaison function performed by the university between the university and the public school was in job recruitment and placement of the student teachers. Especially in the Urban district where teacher shortages were occurring, the university supervisor was observed discussing the strengths of various student teachers with public school staff. University supervisors also reported recruiting and encouraging student teachers to apply for teaching positions. This function was less evident in the Lakeview district, which was not experiencing such a severe shortage and where the university supervisors usually did not have as much influence within the school district.

Discussion. It is appropriate at this point to discuss a fundamental site difference related to the liaison role of the university supervisors. The university supervisors at Metropolitan and Urban district were employed by both the public school district and the university. Their orientation was clearly aligned with that of the public school, in spite of the fact that the teacher training institution paid the major portion of their salaries. They

considered themselves school-based, but often expressed doubt that the program would continue due to budget reductions. So strong was this district orientation that if the district decided to discontinue the program, some supervisors said they would prefer to return to other district-based work rather than other university work.

In addition, it is plausible to view some differences, such as those in teacher and student teacher satisfaction with supervisor performance, as a direct reflection of the relative lack of experience of State University supervisors. Two of the five interviewed spoke of the numbers of semesters they had supervised, while one had no prior experience. The State supervisors were burdened also with the need to fulfill at least two discrete roles, that of supervisor and that of full-time graduate student. This is in marked contrast to the Metropolitan University supervisors, who were fulfilling one full-time role which was endorsed by both institutions.

Description of support systems available to supervisors. The informal processes within the university and public schools also impacted the support systems of the university supervisors. All but one university supervisor mentioned at least two people to whom they could turn for help if a problem arose during student teaching. University supervisors most often mentioned talking to someone in the university administration, followed by contact with a peer group, the cooperating teacher, or the building administrators. Those supervisors at Metropolitan University differed from State University supervisors in that the former group mentioned the formal university system more often than did the State University supervisors; they also mentioned a larger number of contacts than did the five State University supervisors. University supervisors at both sites saw their major support from the university coming in the form of their use of various university personnel for

advice, guest lecturing, demonstrating, and serving as a friendly listener. Only three supervisors referred to materials, library or coursework as resources provided to them by the university for job assistance.

Discussion. In view of the differences described in the nature and quantity of supports mentioned, it seems reasonable to conclude that Metropolitan University supervisors were relatively more knowledgeable of both the formal and informal support systems. Also, the informal support system in which the university supervisors were embedded appeared to depend heavily upon the availability and use of university administrators, together with interpersonal relations with other supervisors.

Description of reward system. A final area where the informal processes of the university were examined as they related to the university supervisors was that of the informal reward system. Supervisory aspects of the job were mentioned most often by the university supervisors when asked how the job met their expectations. For example, they enjoyed working with other adults, the opportunity to plan their own schedules, the career and educational benefits of working with university faculty, and especially, the contacts with teachers and students within the classroom setting. They also mentioned aspects of the job which enriched their own lives, such as being "fulfilled" by a job that was "educational" and "stimulating." Several supervisors mentioned the personal benefit of "being able to learn more about teaching" from working with cooperating teachers while others felt a general sense of accomplishment by improving the profession through their work with preservice teachers. The major reward, however, derived from access to school children and the contact with student teachers on a one-to-one basis. Globally speaking, responses from the supervisors indicated that they received their job satisfaction largely from their contact with people in general.

Although most supervisors spoke positively about their jobs, some problems with the job were mentioned. The most pervasive frustration, reported consistently throughout the semester at both sites, involved the lack of time to meet all the commitments of the job. Part of this problem was related to the student teacher-to-supervisor workload. For the graduate student State University supervisors, who held half-time positions (20 hours per week) and were registered for at least nine required graduate hours (a full-time load), the normal ratio was 12:1. For the full-time faculty members at State who were supervising to complete the faculty workload, five student teachers equaled one-third of that required workload. In contrast, the full-time Metropolitan University supervisors averaged 18 student teachers per supervisor this particular semester (although 25:1 was a more usual ratio when enrollment was up). Aside from the student teacher:supervisor ratio problems, several supervisors reported problems with scheduling either around classes (at State) or with travel time and parking problems resulting from a large number of schools being located in the densely populated Metropolitan University area. These comments should be tempered by the fact that seven of the nine university supervisors reported that this was <u>not</u> a typical semester in terms of workload. The demands upon their time resulting from participation in this study were added to demands placed upon them by a new recruitment policy, according to the Metropolitan supervisors.

Although the problems with time and the sense of being overcommitted were most prevalent, other concerns were also reported. Some supervisors were disappointed by their lack of influence upon either student teachers or the larger teacher education program. Others felt that the amount of paperwork required by the university was excessive or that other supervisors were unprofessional in the conduct of their jobs.

Despite these problems university supervisors derived rewards equally from personal satisfactions with their job performances and from the reactions of cooperating teachers and student teachers to their performance. The university supervisors often reported that their greatest successes were in seeing improvement and growth in the student teachers, especially those individuals who had had problems and to whom the supervisors gave special attention. The supervisors took pride in seeing their suggestions accepted and acted upon by cooperating teachers and student teachers. The university supervisors shared ideas in the specific areas of behavior management, teaching techniques, and instructional planning. These ideas largely coincided with the areas of most concern for the student teachers. Although the university supervisors generally felt that they had done a good job during the semester described in the study, their satisfaction was tempered by the underlying realization that the "key" to a student teacher's success was the work of the cooperating teacher. The formally defined role of the cooperating teacher, so crucial to the student teaching experience, is examined elsewhere in this report (see pp. 72-77). Given this review of informal processes impacting universities and their supervisors of student teachers, some consideration must be given next to similar processes which occur in the public schools, particularly in relation to the cooperating teachers.

Informal Organizational Properties of the Public Schools Relating to the Cooperating Teacher

Although the public schools established formal guidelines to govern student teaching, the actual experience was also affected by the more informal, unique interactions within particular settings. This section will discuss the informal processes of the public school setting, in particular the process of selection and the requirements for cooperating teacher, the

orientation of the cooperating teachers to their role, the responsibilities of the cooperating teachers during the student teaching experience, and the informal support and reward systems that attach to the job.

Description of Selection Requirements and Process

Although formal requirements for selecting cooperating teachers were extant, selection was at some variance with the intended process. Only three of the 20, all from Lakeview, indicated that they had requested a student teacher. Twelve (three at Lakeview, nine at Urban) stated that the building principal or the supervisor "asked me to"; two said that receiving their first student teacher was a surprise; and one stated that "It just happened." The remaining two cooperating teachers from Lakeview indicated that the Masters degree program in which they were enrolled required supervision of a student teacher, so that was their reason for accepting them. Of the latter two teachers, one even added the comment that "Otherwise I wouldn't have thought of having one (student teacher)."

Given that certain public school teachers met the selection guidelines, probably the most important qualification for the job was availability of time and the willingness to use that time to work with a student teacher. When asked how much time in a typical day was spent on activities related to the cooperating teacher's role, eight cooperating teachers reported spending 45 minutes to one hour per day and three reported spending over an hour per day. Four others did not mention a specific time but said it was "extensive." Clearly, the responsibility of working with a student teacher was a time-consuming one for many of the cooperating teachers. The amount of time one had to give may have realistically governed the final selection process for cooperating teachers.

Although certain minimum qualifications were formally established by the public schools for becoming a cooperating teacher, each role group had its own ideas of the qualities needed to be an effective cooperating teacher. While student teachers as a group mentioned the greatest number of qualities they wanted in the ideal cooperating teacher, interestingly none of these included qualifications classified as relating to teaching skills of the cooperating teacher. The student teachers mentioned supervisory skills more than twice as often as background characteristics. Student teachers valued highly the cooperating teachers who gave constructive criticism, shared ideas for the student teachers to use for their own improvement, possessed good communication skills, and allowed the student teacher the opportunity to teach. Although student teachers did mention characteristics like enthusiasm and honesty as desirable, they were far more concerned with the skills the cooperating teachers possessed that could make student teaching a professional growth experience.

In contrast to student teachers, the cooperating teachers and university supervisors placed approximately equal weights on supervisory skills and background characteristics; however, they also mentioned teaching skills. No noticeable qualitative difference between university supervisors and cooperating teachers was seen on the specific supervisory items mentioned. Supervisors and cooperating teachers mentioned openness to new ideas, use of positive reinforcement by cooperating teachers, having high expectations, maintaining open communication, being organized in the supervision aspects of the role, and having the ability to communicate to a novice the art and skill of teaching as desirable qualities of the effective cooperating teacher.

Given this overview of the ways in which teachers explain their acquisition of the cooperating teacher role, and their vision of the effective

cooperating teacher, it is interesting to review their general impressions of other cooperating teachers. More than one-third of the intensive sample (eight out of 20) reported having positive views of most other cooperating teachers. They made comments such as these: "I thought they were much more highly skilled than I would be," or "they are extremely capable people." The next one-third of the sample (seven out of 20) expressed negative views of most other cooperating teachers: "A lot of people think, 'Oh boy, you can goof off' [when you have a student teacher]"; "So many [of them are] poor teachers"; and "Most of them thought the student teacher was good to have along to grade papers." The remaining five cooperating teachers offered either neutral or ambivalent remarks, for example: "I didn't really know very many [of them];" "I don't remember having any thoughts;" "I thought it was a great honor...[but] Since then, I'm told by colleagues that people who become cooperating teachers are idiots because they take on too much work."

Discussion of selection requirements and process. There are many possible reasons for the apparent lack of intrinsic desire to work with student teachers on the part of the cooperating teachers. First and most basic to the present finding is the possibility of sampling error. Recall that cooperating teachers were nominated for selection into the sample by both university and school district personnel on the basis of several criteria, including reputational excellence in classroom teaching. Perhaps outstanding teachers feel less of a need for "extra hands" in their classrooms, and are therefore less likely to request student teachers. It is equally possible that these teachers are somewhat obsessed with the conduct of instruction in their classrooms (to wit, the above quote about 'never thinking of having one'), and therefore feel uncomfortable with either relinquishing control of their classes to student teachers, or the added demands imposed by working

with student teachers, or both. The critical point is that there may be some other as yet unidentified factor associated with both selection into the interviewed sample and an apparent lack of intrinsic motivation for working with student teachers.

The appearance of a site difference, in which nine out of 10 cooperating teachers in the Urban schools reported having been asked by others to take student teachers (only three at Lakeview said this), raises some interesting questions. For example, the formal mechanisms regulating the selection into the cooperating teacher role differs across the two sites, and this could be accurately reflected by the teachers' responses. Therefore an apparent lack of intrinsic motivation for seeking out student teachers could be spurious. To clarify this idea, note that the Urban teachers are required to participate in a formal screening process led by the building principal to determine eligibility to serve as a cooperating teacher. Hence those who control the screening process make their determination known when they ask the qualified classroom teacher(s) to accept a student teacher (thus the response, "I was asked to take one.") Even so, it is clear that there were several functional routes to becoming a cooperating teacher, although only one mechanism was formally described in district publications.

It would appear, also, that two themes emerge from the teachers' comments about other cooperating teachers. One pertains to the influence a student teacher has upon the teacher's workload, and the other pertains to excellence in teaching. In the great majority of cases, those teachers with favorable impressions of cooperating teachers generally described the latter group's teaching as being of very high caliber (without specifying any particular teaching skills, instructional methods, or the like). In addition, a complaint registered by one of the teachers was that of "poor" teaching on the

part of most cooperating teachers, to the degree that she "was just distraught." This further corroborates the existence of a belief that effective cooperating teachers need to have better-than-average instructional skills. The second theme dealt with the effect of supervising student teachers upon the cooperating teachers' normal workload. Several cooperating teachers, who held negative general impressions of others in that role, indicated there was a prevailing yet erroneous belief that student teachers "were good for taking over your classes." As one said, "You really don't [goof off]--you have other duties toward the student teacher that take their place" (referring to routine tasks). The notion that student teachers could not be treated as relief forces thus appears to be a second operative belief or value on the part of teachers in the present study.

Description of Training for the Cooperating Teacher Role

When asked about training for the role of cooperating teacher, a site difference was apparent between the Lakeview public school teachers working with State University and the Urban public school teachers working with Metropolitan University. Only six cooperating teachers, all from the Lakeview school district, said they had received any training that was helpful to them in their role; three had obtained a Masters of Education degree with a concentration in the supervision of student teachers and three others mentioned the state-required inservice meetings specifically for cooperating teachers. Theoretically, all Lakeview cooperating teachers should have attended at least two of these particular inservice meetings each semester that they had served as cooperating teachers. The fact that only three mentioned any of the meetings as helpful may be evidence of the lack of enthusiasm on the part of the cooperating teachers for the inservice they had received. Nearly three-fourths of the cooperating teachers reported having no

specific training which helped them in that role, although six did mention their own experiences as student teachers and as classroom teachers.

When asked if further training would be helpful no major site difference was evident. Ten cooperating teachers said that no further training would be useful: in the words of one, "...I really basically believe it's in doing it and getting a feel from the student teachers," while another said, "...I really don't think so. I think it's just like learning anything else. You have to get into it and then it depends on your philosophy. Teaching is teaching. The same principles are involved...make things clear, you have to help, you have to step back, you have a personality to work with."

Of those teachers who did identify some further training which they thought might be helpful, six were from Lakeview and four were from Urban. These cooperating teachers saw a need for more specific information on the university requirements for student teaching, the content of teacher education courses, and the teacher preparation programs in general. These cooperating teachers also mentioned a need for more training in supervisory skills like time management and assertiveness, as well as more opportunities both to observe other teachers teaching and to share ideas with other cooperating teachers. Eleven of the cooperating teachers indicated that they had spent little or no time observing other cooperating teachers while three indicated that they had spent some time observing other cooperating teachers working with student teachers. Only four reported purposefully visiting other classes for observation purposes; two of these were related to graduate course requirements for the Masters of Education degree. Two other cooperating teachers were able to observe other cooperating teachers incidentally in open classrooms. Given the relative scarcity of training for cooperating teachers, and the rarity of observation of peers, some concerted program of cooperating

teacher training, combining some peer observation, supervisory skill development, and increased interface with the teacher education programs, may be indicated.

Description of Orientation to the Role of Cooperating Teacher

Although formal guidelines were available at both sites, the dissemination of the guidelines was variable. Of the 10 cooperating teachers in the Urban district, eight mentioned written guidelines in the form of a booklet prepared by the local district. However, several of these teachers perceived that the guidelines were not being distributed uniformly since they had learned of their existence serendipitously. Of the eight cooperating teachers who discussed the guidelines, five spoke of them in positive terms: "excellent," "tremendously helpful," "lays out everything you should cover with them," "very comprehensive," and "clearly defines what is to be expected." Several of the cooperating teachers mentioned that they thought the guidelines for the Urban district were no longer being published and distributed.

The situation at Lakeview was quite different. Two cooperating teachers linked the guidelines to the particular university supervisor with whom they were working while another cooperating teacher mentioned the university supervisor guidelines, the university guidelines, and the local district guidelines. One other cooperating teacher developed his/her own pacing guide and another used one developed during a university course. Only one cooperating teacher offered evaluative comments on the guidelines calling them "good basic pacing guides...with lots of information." The perception that guidelines were idiosyncratic to the supervisors was illustrated by the comment, "...different supervisors do it totally different (sic)...(university

supervisors) come in all sizes and colors and some of them come with checklist kinds of things to do."

Given the variations in formal and informal orientations to the role of cooperating teacher, similar variations in role perceptions of the cooperating teachers would not seem surprising. When asked to describe their prime responsibilities as cooperating teachers, those cooperating teachers in the Urban district gave longer responses, with more specific responsibilities mentioned than did the cooperating teachers at Lakeview. However, responses from both sites were equally divided between discussions of the nuts and bolts of supervision and more ill-defined, global goal statements. Cooperating teachers conveyed both a sense of duty to prepare the student teacher "for the first year of teaching with all the skills necessary" and a sense of duty to "provide a positive situation in which to gain first experience." In other words, some of the cooperating teachers saw student teaching as on-the-job training which should match the real world of teaching as much as possible while others saw it as a more insulated, artificial setting for novices to be eased into teaching under the most positive conditions possible. Despite these differences in philosophy, the cooperating teachers generally wanted to show the student teachers "what works" and "what's expected of a teacher" while also enabling the student teachers to develop "their own teaching styles," at the same time insuring that "everyone in the class" was learning.

Description of Responsibilities to the Student Teacher

A third area where the informal processes of the public schools influenced the student teaching experience was the area of the cooperating teacher's responsibilities. These included providing information and orientation, helping the student teacher with planning, participating in

observation, feedback, and evaluation as well as serving as a mediator between the student teacher and university supervisor.

Orientation and information for student teachers. Although 14 of the student teachers reported attending some orientation given in the public school by the principal or by another administrator, cooperating teachers were mentioned most frequently as having first made student teachers aware of their responsibilities. Seven student teachers stated that their cooperating teachers also provided individual orientation to the school building, the particular classroom, and the students. While 13 student teachers mentioned receiving some written guidelines about student teaching, only two thought they were helpful. When compared to university supervisors and public school administrators, the cooperating teachers were more often considered the main source of information by student teachers when determining their roles and responsibilities.

Planning. Ten cooperating teachers did report spending some time conferring with their student teachers about planning. Planning sessions for two student teachers took place in the morning immediately before class began; as a consequence they were typically unaware of what they were to teach specifically and how they were to teach until that time. They did not seem to be particularly concerned with this practice. Two other student teachers reported planning conferences often held over the telephone the evening before lessons were to be taught. A few indicated regular, weekly afternoon planning conferences. One university supervisor did indicate that within his/her experience cooperating teachers generally did not spend enough time planning with the student teachers, possibly because the cooperating teachers themselves did not possess adequate planning skills. The planning practices

of the cooperating teachers and student teachers echoed other aspects of the student teaching experience in their variety.

Observation and feedback. In contrast to the university supervisors with their weekly or biweekly observations, most cooperating teachers indicated that they observed the student teachers almost continuously. These observations were rarely formal and produced short, jotted notes as written records; only three of the Lakeview cooperating teachers reported making the university-requested weekly observations using self-carbon anecdotal forms. Three cooperating teachers reported deliberate non-use of the requested forms, because their student teachers did not think they got anything out of these observations: "She and I agree that [observations] that are written, that just say what she's doing, really don't get much feedback...probably because I don't know how to use them."

Cooperating teachers also differed in the focus of their observations. Ten cooperating teachers stated that their major focus was on the preparation and delivery of lessons by the student teachers. Eight cooperating teachers reported looking mainly at behavior management and the student teacher's control of the classroom because "that's where it's at." Other cooperating teachers also concentrated on classroom students' success in the lesson, student responses to the student teacher, or the general atmosphere of the classroom. Three cooperating teachers also focused on the personality of the student teacher, how the student teacher handled him/herself in the class, or how the student teacher felt about his/her performance. In the words of one, "Even if she happens to teach the wrong thing content-wise by accident or leave something out, as long as she feels good about what she's doing, that's important."

Just as most cooperating teachers observed informally and continuously, feedback on performance was also given to the student teachers informally and continuously. Every opportunity to talk during the day was seized while short, encouraging notes were often left by cooperating teachers on lesson plans or notebooks. Some cooperating teachers chose to "hit everything" since time was short and the student teacher had much to learn; other cooperating teachers took one behavior at a time to avoid overwhelming the student teachers with constant surveillance and feedback.

Three cooperating teachers who had completed a training program for supervision of student teachers used the observation-feedback system that they had learned in that program. Four related processes were involved: (1) the student teacher had to define his/her concerns, (2) the cooperating teacher made observations related to those concerns, (3) the cooperating teacher and student teacher "looked at" pupil behavior, and finally, (4) they generated a list of teacher behaviors that contributed to the student behaviors. If the student teachers' concerns did not change, the process remained in the fourth stage of looking at teacher behaviors related to that one concern. According to one of the three cooperating teachers, the evaluation of the student teacher was still based upon a formal observation measuring the final evaluation criteria established by the university (regardless of the amount of progress made with the targeted behaviors).

In contrast to the university supervisors, the activities of the cooperating teachers were much more congruent with the student teachers' perceptions and stated expectations of those activities. All student teachers expected to spend more time conferring with the cooperating teacher than on any other activity associated with student teaching. They expected to be observed on a continuous or daily basis with daily or at least weekly feedback

on their performance. It will be remembered that the cooperating teachers reported making continual observations and giving frequent, informal feedback. At this same point in the experience, and for the sake of comparison, many student teachers had no clear perception of the university supervisors' observation and feedback plans and schedules.

Student teachers and cooperating teachers also exhibited congruence between what they thought were the foci of the observations and feedback. Both reported approximately equal emphases on behavior management and teaching methods and hints. Student teachers, like the cooperating teachers, reported that the feedback contained suggestions for teaching, followed by evaluation of the actual teaching and lesson plans. Two student teachers reported receiving anecdotal records, the basic observation-feedback system used at State University, that consisted (in their cases) mostly of frequency counts of their own and their students' behaviors.

Despite the agreement between the perceptions of the student teachers and the cooperating teachers, thirteen student teachers indicated ways in which their cooperating teachers could have been more helpful. Nine student teachers had specific requests related to the activities of teaching: more sharing of ideas for lesson, help with lesson content, more guidance in preparing the first unit, help with questioning, and help with long range goals for that particular grade level. Four other student teachers desired more informal communication, more constructive criticism, and more sharing of information in general by the cooperating teacher. On the other hand, eight of the 20 student teachers stated that their cooperating teachers could not have been more helpful. On the whole, cooperating teachers appear to have communicated successfully to their student teachers the expected style, frequency, and content of the observation and feedback process.

Evaluation. Another major responsibility of the cooperating teacher was to evaluate the performance of the student teacher. Thirteen of the cooperating teachers used the university-provided forms as the basis of their evaluations while six based their evaluations upon how the students in the class responded to the student teachers, either socially or academically. No cooperating teacher offered any praise for the instrument used for evaluation although several remarked upon some problems with the instruments: for example, lack of understanding of what the criteria really meant, and criteria that didn't really tell whether the student teacher was "good or bad" (this is especially interesting in view of the response tendency described earlier). One cooperating teacher made the evaluation by "looking at the sheet and thinking about those areas in which they talk about, and just my own feelings about whether or not skills make a good teacher or not." One other cooperating teacher, who was working with a student teacher for the first time, had the impression that cooperating teachers were not included in the evaluation process, a definite misconception. This misunderstanding may have occurred because the new cooperating teacher was working with a State University supervisor who was also new to the job.

The apparent dependence of cooperating teachers upon the official criteria of the universities was interesting, especially in light of the criteria they used to evaluate their own performances. Ten of the cooperating teachers judged their own successes by "growth" exhibited by the student teachers in managing the classroom, reaching their objectives and establishing rapport with the students. Seven cooperating teachers evaluated their own performances by the status of communications between themselves and their student teachers. The new cooperating teacher who was unclear about

evaluating the student teacher also had not yet identified criteria for his/her self-evaluation.

Discussion. Since the cooperating teachers were inclined to use rather open-ended criteria in their informal self-evaluations, their adherence to the university criteria on student teacher evaluation forms did serve to remove some of the guesswork for the student teachers. However, it seems reasonable to state that the evaluation process is not as clear as it could be. Recall that 13 out of the 20 cooperating teachers actually followed the criteria on evaluation forms while nearly one-third of the sample did not. Although it is important to retain the perspective that a select sample of teachers were participants in the present study, that proportion seems large enough to warrant further investigation into issues such as the perceived utility of evaluation forms, the provision of instruction on how the forms might best be used, and so on.

Description of liaison between student teacher and university supervisor. Another important responsibility of the cooperating teachers was to serve as a liaison between the university supervisors and the student teachers. Their services in this area were highly valued, especially by the State University supervisors; four of the five said that the cooperating teachers had been most helpful in supplying information to the university supervisor regarding the teaching performance of the student teacher. In the opinions of the university supervisors, this information was based upon much more exposure to the day-to-day strengths and weaknesses exhibited by the student teachers in their classroom performance than was the information gathered by university supervisors themselves. Such information was therefore considered vital by the university supervisors if they were to make fair, objective evaluations of the student teachers' performances.

Secondly, the cooperating teachers were perceived by the university supervisors as carrying a large burden of the responsibility for leading student teachers in the process of teaching. This, of course, relieved the supervisors of some responsibility.

Finally, both student teachers and university supervisors considered the cooperating teachers to be their supporters and confidants, especially if problems arose. The cooperating teachers were seen as available, knowledgeable persons who could be approached for assistance by either university supervisors or student teachers. Both groups remarked that many cooperating teachers provided them much in the way of "emotional, psychological" support throughout the experience.

Description of Cooperating Teachers' Support System

The informal processes within the university and public schools also affected the support systems of the cooperating teachers. No differences were noted between the two sites in regard to either the number or roles of people to whom cooperating teachers could turn for help with problems. University supervisors were mentioned by nearly all cooperating teachers, followed by principals, friends and family, and student teachers. However, three cooperating teachers in the Urban district said that the university supervisors were strongly supportive, and not one cooperating teacher said anything negative about the quality of work of the university supervisors. Two Lakeview cooperating teachers did voice concerns about the State University supervisors; one was seen as a "cold individual," who took himself "very seriously." Another said that "a lot (of supervisors) are young doctoral students who are out to impress everybody." They were "very intimidating to the student teachers, never available...I rarely turn to them for anything. When I did I was very disappointed." The more permanent status

of the Metropolitan University supervisors and their reputation within the district among cooperating teachers may have enhanced the perceptions of their supportive role. It was interesting to note that, unlike university supervisors who also mentioned their peer group, no cooperating teacher mentioned specifically going to another cooperating teacher for help with a problem related to student teaching.

Description of Cooperating Teachers' Reward System

A final area where the informal processes of the public school were examined as they related to the cooperating teachers was that of an informal reward system. Since the financial rewards for cooperating teachers were so minimal ($10.00 at one site and $200.00 at the other site), the benefits of being a cooperating teacher accrued from other sources. Although 14 student teachers related their satisfaction with their experience to the knowledge and experience of the cooperating teachers, only four cooperating teachers reported receiving compliments in that area. Cooperating teachers looked elsewhere for rewards; they valued most the opportunity to have another adult in the classroom (in some cases to free them to work more with individual students), next the opportunity to induct a new professional into their "kind of teaching," the opportunity to learn new ideas, observe another teacher, and see progress in the student teacher.

The successes in student teaching recalled by the cooperating teachers did change over the semester. Early in the semester the cooperating teachers reported being most successful in establishing rapport with the student teachers and in seeing some progress in the student teachers' confidence and relaxation before the class. At the end of the semester, cooperating teachers indicated their successes were in providing a good student teaching experience and in seeing progress again in the confidence of the student teacher (note

the parallel to the terms they employed to describe their student teachers' strengths). Evidently, cooperating teachers tended to place a good deal of effort in forming pleasant working relationships as soon as possible. This seems to be a logical necessity since nine cooperating teachers planned to benefit from having that extra adult in the classroom. Both student teachers and cooperating teachers stated that their relationships were good or excellent, ranging from being "friends" to being respected fellow professionals. Only one cooperating teacher and one student teacher (not a dyad) said the relationship with their colleague was a neutral one.

Cooperating teachers could also be expected to draw a reward from having a sense of doing a good job as a cooperating teacher. An interesting site difference emerged when cooperating teachers were asked what kind of job they thought they had done. Nine of the Urban district cooperating teachers reported that they had been "excellent" cooperating teachers. They had "worked hard," "put in a lot of time," and "got even more across than usual." One measured success when the student teacher still wanted to be a teacher. These cooperating teachers exuded a sense of well-being and pride in their work. On the other hand, this sense was lacking in the Lakeview district cooperating teachers. One was frustrated by the lack of time for family, his/her own teaching and supervision, while three others said they had worked very hard but didn't see much for their efforts. One said he/she had given as much as possible, and another didn't have a sense of how well he/she had done the job. Only one cooperating teacher expressed a positive sense of accomplishment and this was based upon the student teacher's statement of appreciation.

Discussion. The differences between the two sites may be related to two factors: the criteria cooperating teachers used for self-evaluation and the

selection process differences. It will be recalled that the cooperating teachers based their self-evaluations upon the rapport or communications established with the student teachers together with student teachers' progress through the semester. Both of these criteria were fairly nebulous (even though parallel to the informal criteria applied to the evaluation of the student teachers), making self-evaluation difficult. The cooperating teachers in the Urban district considered themselves master teachers; most had been sought out and had more experience as cooperating teachers. They displayed a sense of pride in being a cooperating teacher. This sense of being special, or above average, may have carried over to their end-of-semester self-evaluation. Regardless, the cooperating teachers in the Urban district were certainly drawing rewards from their own sense of satisfaction, which was absent for the Lakeview district cooperating teachers.

Summary

This report integrates a variety of quantitative and qualitative data resulting from a major, multi-site investigation into student teaching conducted by the Research in Teacher Education (RITE) staff during the fall of 1981. One in a series of documents, the present report focuses exclusively upon the description of various contextual influences upon the preservice clinical teacher education experience. It is organized into four major sections which review the methodology and data analysis; the characteristics of participating universities, elementary and secondary schools and their populations; the formal regulations of participating universities and school systems which govern student teaching; and the informal organizational properties of the participating universities and public schools. Each of these sections will be summarized in turn.

The first section described specifically (1) the sample which served as the source for data; (2) the procedures used in data collection; and, (3) the analyses applied to the various types of data. Briefly, two sites participated in the study. Forty-three cooperating teachers, 44 student teachers, and 13 university supervisors were from State University and the adjacent Lakeview district; 45 cooperating teachers, 49 student teachers, and four university supervisors were from Metropolitan University and the Urban school district. Ten triads from each site participated more intensively in the study than the remaining triads. All participants responded to three sets of instruments and questionnaires (beginning, middle, and end of the semester); the intensive sample additionally kept personal logs, audiotaped their conferences, and were observed and interviewed by RITE staff members on several occasions during the semester. The interview data were coded through a reduction system which permitted the identification of thematic content, while simultaneously preserving the participants' language. Documents presenting institutional rules and regulations governing student teaching were examined, and related to one another for consistency or contrast in context. Questionnaire data were analyzed through calculation of both descriptive and inferential statistics (most notably the analysis of variance and hierarchical analysis of variance). Analyses of other data are presented elsewhere (e.g., Hughes & Hukill, Note 3).

The second major section of the paper presented and discussed a series of findings about the characteristics of participating universities, elementary and secondary schools, and their populations. First, the approximate number of students enrolled at each university was described, as was the number of faculty in each institution's College of Education. Next, it was observed that 34.8% of the principals of participating schools were women, and that on

the average Urban schools contained twice as many administrators and teachers as did the Lakeview schools. Pupils in the Urban schools represented a greater variety of cultures (as indexed by languages spoken) than did the pupils in Lakeview schools. There were also, on the average, more pupils per classroom in the Urban schools. However, Lakeview schools were characterized by greater variety in grade level composition. Information about pupil and school neighborhood socioeconomic status (SES) was also presented. Both sites, on the average, consisted mostly of pupils from middle and low income families, with lower incomes appearing to be somewhat overrepresented. Slightly more Urban than Lakeview schools were in low SES neighborhoods. Certain other contextual factors (e.g., parental involvement in the schools, special school programs) were briefly discussed. All of the above contextual information was utilized to assist in the interpretation of findings from analyses of variance calculated on the five factor subscales of the Teacher Work-Life Inventory (Blumberg & Kleinke, Note 9) and on the Student Teacher Satisfaction and Expectations Scales (Hughes & Hukill, Note 3).

The third major portion of the report examined the formal organizational properties of the two participating universities, as these impacted student teaching. Those regulations directly governing the teacher education programs at each university were considered first. In particular, the requirements for admission into the programs, as well as for entering student teaching, were reviewed and found to be largely similar. However, those at State appeared to be a little more detailed and required a somewhat higher grade point average for entering student teaching.

Next, rules guiding the process of assigning student teachers to placements were reviewed; a clear contrast in the formal statements was observed. The process at State University was found to be centralized, i.e.,

the administrator who serves as Director of Field Experiences was responsible for assigning placements. In contrast, the university supervisors at Metropolitan were responsible for assigning placements. Requirements for satisfactory completion of student teaching were also presented; those at Metropolitan seemed to mention more specific "how-to's," while those at State seemed to suggest parameters within which the student teachers were expected to operate. State University regulations appeared to focus upon absences and outside responsibilities as potential problems more than the regulations at Metropolitan.

The certification or credentialing processes and requirements at each institution were discussed, also. Differences in the number of requirements printed in the handbooks were clearly evident (Metropolitan having more). One of the two sites offered permanent certification only; the other could provide an intermediate or "preliminary" credential pending completion of additional, postgraduate work.

The grievance procedures available to cooperating teachers and supervisors at each site were reviewed next and found to be quite similar. Both sites seemed to have similar due process requirements, such that the student teachers in question were to be notified at the earliest possible time, and the cooperating teachers were expected to make their concerns known initially to the university supervisor. One contrast was apparent: the guidelines available to Metropolitan's teachers clearly stated that a cooperating teacher may refuse to permit a student teacher to continue at that placement, regardless of the supervisor's opinion.

Both institutions were found to have job placement services available to their student teachers. In one case, signing up with the placement office was

optional (though strongly encouraged). In the other, it was required; no fees were charged to students for opening the file.

The remainder of the third major section of the report focused upon university and/or school district regulations governing the selection of individuals into the roles of supervisor or cooperating teacher, and the responsibilities formally designated with those roles. Clear contrasts were apparent in the regulations concerning the selection of supervisors. Most of those at State University were chosen as teaching assistants from eligible graduate students. Those at Metropolitan were chosen jointly by the district and the university through a selection committee from tenured and credentialed district personnel who had already obtained a master's or other advanced degree. There are also differences in the student teaching responsibilities of supervisors at the two sites in the areas of: providing orientations to student teachers (State regulations were more detailed); the observation/feedback procedures to be utilized (none are specified at Metropolitan); the evaluation of student teachers; and the liaison function which the supervisor was to serve (in one case supervisors were expected to assist in inservice staff development, while in the other they were cautioned against trying to improve the classroom teachers' performance). There was much greater apparent consistency across the two sites in the selection and responsibilities assigned to cooperating teachers. Here the major concern was clearly that of shared professionalism in the classroom, intended to promote the student teachers' autonomous functioning; yet it was somewhat disquieting to note the lack of operational definitions for many global terms or phrases (e.g., "accepts the student teacher" or "ability to relate to others"). Because of such minimal specificity, the informal processes which impact student teaching triads might be significant sources of influence.

The fourth major section of this report presented findings (largely from interview data) about the informal organizational properties of universities, as they impacted the preservice clinical teacher education experience. The areas of placement and grievances were addressed, together with informal processes specifically related to university supervisors. Briefly, cooperating teachers at Lakeview reported having volunteered for their role, but having been selected to fill it by their building principals. Study participants from Lakeview and State University indicated also that a variety of strategies were utilized to achieve placement of student teachers, despite the published regulations which designate this as a responsibility of the Director of the Office of Student Field Experiences. The teachers in the Urban school district tended to report having been selected for their role through the established formal channels, although variations from this were reported. Consistent with the Metropolitan University publications, student teacher placement was described as being the university supervisors' responsibility. Also, participants at both sites indicated that they would approach problems with the student teaching experience in a parallel fashion, turning first to the supervisors and/or cooperating teachers for assistance.

Those informal processes specifically related to university supervisors were varied, beginning with selection requirements and role orientation through to the support and reward systems associated with that job. Briefly, supervisors at one site indicated that relatively mundane considerations often determined their self-selection into the role (e.g., time constraints or the need for extra income), whereas those at the other site reportedly chose to become supervisors as a means of continuing their own professional growth and contributing to the profession. Supervisors' role orientation and perceptions of role responsibilities were varied and interesting; generally they included

more responsibilities than a reading of formal guidelines would imply. Also, State university supervisors indicated that they had little influence upon establishing student teacher placements, whereas Metropolitan supervisors assumed direct responsibility for placing student teachers in situations that would provide valuable learning experiences. The mismatch in student teacher expectations for observation, feedback, and conferencing, relative to supervisors' actual observation, feedback and conferencing were discussed. Attention was given also to the evaluation process, and the problematic kinds of criteria which could be applied to student teachers. The supervisors' liaison function was reviewed, and some marked contrasts across sites were discussed. Finally, some site differences were observed when the reward and support systems available to supervisors were described.

The last major section of the report presented findings about the informal organizational properties of the public schools in relation to the cooperating teachers. Among these were the selection of teachers into the cooperating teacher role, their responsibilities in that role, and the attendant informal reward and support systems. Specifically, most cooperating teachers indicated that their selection into that role was at some variance with the formally stated process. Each role group indicated that certain qualities were necessary for being an effective cooperating teacher, though there were variations in the number and kinds of qualities named. A site difference was observed when cooperating teachers were asked whether or not they had received training for their role; however, about half of the teachers at either site agreed that no further training would really be useful to the conduct of that role. Variations in the formal versus informal orientation to the role, as well as in perceptions of the role, were discussed. Last, the teachers' responsibilities to student teachers in the areas of orientation,

planning, observation and feedback, evaluation, and service as a liaison were reviewed. Most student teachers reported having received accurate information from their cooperating teachers about these performance areas, although variation across triads continued to be the apparent norm. Also, both supervisors and student teachers indicated that the cooperating teachers were a major source of support, while cooperating teachers reported relying upon the supervisors for support (i.e., the support between these two role groups was mutual). Last, the rewards available to cooperating teachers for serving in that role were apparently not financial, and a site difference occurred in which the Urban cooperating teachers were better able to draw rewards from their own sense of satisfaction than the Lakeview cooperating teachers.

In conclusion, several implications of these findings for student teaching, and for teacher education in general, were drawn. The intention of so doing was to serve as a stimulus for program self-evaluation at teacher education institutions, and as a basis for improvement in the cooperative endeavors of public schools with teacher education institutions to provide worthwhile and effective preservice clinical experiences for future teachers. The major implication for educational researchers was perhaps indirectly stated, but should have been apparent throughout the text. Educational research conducted in a vacuum--that is to say, without consideration for both broad and specific contextual factors-- may often be either difficult to interpret or devoid of real meaning, in turn contributing to the difficulty that practitioners experience in attempting to apply results to improvement of their work. It is time for researchers to open their eyes and their research designs to the "messy" but particularly critical contextual factors that impinge upon educational experiences; let this report serve as a major step to that end.

Reference Notes

1. Griffin, G. A., Hughes, G. R., Jr., Barnes, S., Carter, H., Defino, M., & Edwards, S. The student teaching experience (Research proposal submitted to National Institute of Education). Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, June 1981.
2. Hughes, G. R., Jr., O'Neal, S., & Griffin, G. A. Clinical teacher education - Preservice: Site and participant description (An Interim Report) submitted to National Institute of Education). Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, October 1981.
3. Hughes, G. R., Jr., & Hukill, H. Participant characteristics, change, and outcomes in preservice clinical teacher education (Report No. 9020). Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, July 1982.
4. Lacefield, W. E., & Cole, H. P. Starting point for curricular change: A predisposition and suitability measure for client groups. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, February 1973.
5. Hughes, R., Jr., Griffin, G. A., & Defino, M. E. Personality factors in the student teaching triad. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City, March 1982.
6. MacDonald, A. P., Jr., & Tseng, M. S. Dimension of internal versus external locus of control revisited: Toward the development of a measure of generalized expectancy. Unpublished manuscript, West Virginia University, 1972.

7. Hunt, D. E., Greenwood, J., Noy, J. E., & Watson, J. Assessment of conceptual level: Paragraph completion method. Toronto: Ontario Institute of Studies in Education, June 1973.

8. LaMonica, E. Construct validity of an empathy instrument. Unpublished manuscript, New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1980.

9. Blumberg, A., & Kleinke, D. J. An instrument for describing the work-life of teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April 1981.

10. Evertson, C. M., & Hickman, R. C. Tasks of teaching classes of varied group composition (Report No. 6110). Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1981.

11. Barnes, S. Synthesis of selected research on teaching findings. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1981.

12. Good, T. L. Classroom research: What we know and what we need to know. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1982.

References

Bandura, A. Principles of behavior modification. New York: Holt, 1969.

Basic elementary orientation bulletin (BEOB) (Rev. ed.). (Urban, Western State: Metropolitan University)[1], 1977.

Bulletin of the (Metropolitan University) School of Education (Vol. 6). (Urban, Western State: Metropolitan University), 1981.

(Doe, J.) Guiding student teachers: A manual for the supervising teachers in the (State University) student teaching program. (Lakeview, Southwestern State: State University), 1979.

(Doe, J.) Handbook for student teachers. (Lakeview, Southwestern State: State University), 1979.

(Doe, J.) Handbook for university student teaching supervisors. (Lakeview, Southwestern State: State University), 1979.

Ferster, C. B., & Skinner, B. F. Schedules of reinforcement. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.

Festinger, L. The psychology of insufficient rewards. American Psychologist, 1961, 16, 1-11.

Griffin, G. A. Levels of decision-making. In J. I. Goodlad (Ed.), Curriculum inquiry. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979.

Hoy, W. K., & Rees, R. The socialization of student teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 1977, 28, 23-26.

Poole, C. The influence of experiences in the schools on students' evaluation of teaching practice. The Journal of Educational Research, 1972, 66 (4), 161-164.

[1]Pseudonyms indicated by enclosure of names in parentheses have been used in referencing documents to protect the anonymity of study participants.

Pruitt, W. K., & Lee, J. F. Hidden handcuffs in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 1978, 29, 69-72.

Student teaching in (Lakeview) (Rev. ed.). (Lakeview, Southwestern State: Lakeview Independent School District), 1978.

Teacher education: A student handbook (Rev. ed.). (Lakeview, Southwestern State: State University), 1980.

Teacher Education Guidelines for Elementary and Secondary Schools. (Urban, Western State: Urban Unified School District), 1975.

Appendix A

Background Information

1. Name_____
2. Sex: Male_____ Female_____ 3. Age_____
4. Ethnicity: Anglo_____ Asian_____ Black_____ Hispanic_____
   Other_____ (specify)
5. Level you plan to teach (if preservice) or are now teaching (if inservice)
   Preschool_____ Elementary_____ Junior High_____
   Senior High_____ College_____ Other ___(Specify)
6. Number of years teaching experience_____
7. Father's occupation_____
8. Mother's occupation_____
9. Number of Brothers and Sisters_____
10. Your order of birth 1st__ 2nd__ 3rd__ 4th__ 5th__ Over 5th__
11. Describe the type of community in which you lived during most of your childhood: rural___ urban___ suburban___ inner city___ small town___
    Name the elementary school that you attended:_____
12. Indicate the socioeconomic status of the majority of the students.
    low_____ middle_____ upper_____
13. Indicate the approximate percentage of students in each ethnic group.
    Anglo_____ Asian_____ Black_____ Hispanic_____ Other_____
14. Indicate the size of the school.
    Small (500 or less)___ Medium (500-1500)___ Large (Over 1500)___
15. Indicate your general impression of elementary school.
    Mostly favorable___ Somewhat favorable___ Neutral___
    Somewhat unfavorable___ Most unfavorable___

PLEASE TURN OVER

Name the junior high you attended:_____

(if more than one, name the one you attended longest)

16. Indicate the socioeconomic status of the majority of the students.

low_____ middle_____ upper_____

17. Indicate the approximate percentage of students in each ethnic group.

Anglo_____ Asian_____ Black_____ Hispanic_____ Other_____

18. Indicate the size of the school.

Small (500 or less)____ Medium (500-1500)____ Large (over 1500)____

19. Indicate your general impression of junior high school.

Mostly favorable___ Somewhat favorable___ Neutral___

Somewhat unfavorable___ Most unfavorable___

Name the high school you attended:_____

(if more than one, name the one you attended longest)

20. Indicate the socioeconomic status of the majority of the students.

low_____ middle_____ upper_____

21. Indicate the approximate percentage of students in each ethnic group.

Anglo____ Asian____ Black____ Hispanic____ Other____

22. Indicate the size of the school.

Small (500 or less)____ Medium (500-1500)____ Large (over 1500)____

23. Indicate your general impression of high school.

Mostly favorable___ Somewhat favorable___ Nuetral___

Somewhat unfavorable___ Most unfavorable___

24. Indicate your approximate high school rank.

Top 2%____ Top 10%____ Top 25%____ Top 50%____ Bottom 50%____

25. Indicate the type of undergraduate college you attended.

public_____ private religious_____ private nonreligious_____

26. Your undergraduate major:_____ minor:_____

27. Indicate your general impression of college.

Mostly favorable_____ Somewhat favorable_____ Neutral_____

Somewhat unfavorable_____ Most unfavorable_____

28. Indicate the number of graduate hours you have earned:_____

29. Have you earned a graduate degree? Yes____ No____

If yes, what degree?_____

Teaching experience ---- Describe your teaching situation during most of your teaching career or student teaching experience.

---

30. The size of the school in which you teach:

Small (to 500)____ Medium (500-1500)____ Large (over 1500)____

31. The type of community in which you teach:

rural____ urban____ suburban____ inner city____ small town____

32. The socioeconomic status of the majority of students you teach:

low_____ medium_____ upper_____

33. Indicate the approximate percentage of students in each ethnic group.

Anglo____ Asian____ Black____ Hispanic____ Other____

34. How long have you been at your present school?

0-1 yrs.____ 2-3 yrs.____ 4-7 yrs.____ 8-11 yrs.____ 12-15 yrs.____

over 15 yrs.____

35. Have you held any other jobs besides teaching? Yes____ No____

What? (List jobs and how long you held them.)

PLEASE TURN OVER

36. List the professional organizations to which you belong.